

FEB 9 1922

Volume XXXVII

FEBRUARY, 1922

Number 2

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

WILLIAM KURRELMMEYER

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

CONTENTS

TOLMAN, A. H.—Shakespeare's Manipulation of his Sources in 'As You Like It,'	65
SNYDER, F. B.—Notes on Burns and England,	76
ZEYDEL, E. H.—The Rimes of Stefan George,	82
CUMMINGS, H.—Chaucer's 'Prologue,' 1-7,	86
MERRILL, L. R.—Vaughan's Influence upon Wordsworth's Poetry,	91
LANCASTER, H. C.—Seventeenth-Century Prosody: "Hier"; "Fléau"; "Meurtrier"; "Fuir,"	96
CHINARD, G.—Chateaubriand et l'Abbé C. F. Painchaud,	101

Reviews:—

GUSTAVE COHEN, <i>Mystères et Moralités du manuscrit 617 de Chantilly.</i> [<i>Grace Frank.</i>]	106
OLIVER ELTON, <i>A Survey of English Literature, 1780-1880.</i> [<i>L. N. Broughton.</i>]	110
CARL VAN DOREN, <i>The American Novel.</i> [<i>J. C. French.</i>]	115

Correspondence:—

RUDMOSE-BROWN, T. B., <i>La Galerie du Palais,</i>	117
LANCASTER, H. C., <i>A Reply,</i>	118
EMERSON, O. F., <i>Milton's Comus, 93-94,</i>	118
SMITH, C. A., " <i>Under the sonne he loketh,</i> "	120
VAN ROOSBROECK, G. L., <i>A Lost Play by Alexandre Hardy: La Folle de Olidamant,</i>	121
BURLINGAME, E. W., <i>Etymology of Burlingame (Burlingham),</i>	123

Brief Mention:—

F. P. LE BUFFE, <i>The Hound of Heaven: An Interpretation;</i> —T. R. SMITH, <i>Anthology of Swinburne's Poems,</i>	124
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year—Single Copy (Current) Sixty-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION with inter-
mission from July to October (inclusive)

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to æsthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is
\$5.00 for the United States and Mexico; Canada \$5.25
and \$5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; for the French Department to H. Carrington Lancaster; for the Italian and Spanish Departments to Gustav Gruenbaum. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays and other separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-reference.

OXFORD SERIES OF NEW ENGLISH CLASSICS A NEW VOLUME

Metaphysical Lyrics and Poems of the Seventeenth Century

Selected and Edited, with an Essay

By HERBERT J. C. GRIERSON

To the popular series edited by Mr. Nichol Smith (Mr. Percy Simpson's *Every Man in His Humour*, Mr. Pearsall Smith's selection from Donne's *Sermons*, Mr. Nichol Smith's own *Characters*, Miss Hadow's *Raleigh*, Mr. Chapman's *Boswell*) Prof. Grierson now adds a volume representative of the *School of Donne*. The authors include, beside Donne himself, Milton (the *Hymn*), George Herbert, Lord Herbert of Cherbury, Carew, Suckling, Cleveland, Crashaw, Lovelace, Vaughan, Cowley, Marvell, Quarles, and others. The poems are in three sections: Love Poems, Divine Poems, and Miscellaneous—Elegies, Satires, and the like.

Copies of the above for examination with a view to class use may be had on request



OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

American Branch

35 WEST 32ND STREET, NEW YORK



MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXVII

FEBRUARY, 1922

NUMBER 2

SHAKESPEARE'S MANIPULATION OF HIS SOURCES IN *AS YOU LIKE IT*

Nothing is more characteristic of Shakespeare than his ability to discern the dramatic possibilities of a story or a portion of history, and his skill in transforming such material into a fully developed, unified, thrilling drama. Says Professor ten Brink:

"Seldom or never can the literary artist use his material in just the form in which it presents itself to him; for almost never does it correspond completely to the idea which he either recognizes in it or imparts to it. Therefore the Poet exercises his right to transform the fable in accordance with his purpose, that is, into agreement with his own idea. . . . The deeper, the clearer, the more powerful and complete the nature, the personality of the poet is, so much more successful will be the gradual shaping, the refashioning of his fable. An unrivalled master in this field, far more than in the field of composition, is Shakespeare; his greatness displays itself most of all in the infallible intuition with which he feels his way to the tragic [dramatic] elements of a story and brings these forth to complete dramatic expression."¹

An excellent illustration of Shakespeare's manipulation of a borrowed story is offered if we compare the comedy *As You Like It* with its principal source, the euphuistic pastoral romance of Thomas Lodge, *Rosalynde*, which appeared in 1590. The very closeness with which the dramatist follows his original, forces upon our attention the great value of his changes, even when they are but slight. At every turn, rejoicing over some small addition, some slight omission, or some minor change, we find ourselves saying with Browning:

¹Translated from a pamphlet, *Über die Aufgabe der Litteraturgeschichte*, Strassburg, 1891, pp. 18-19.

Oh, the little more, and how much it is!
And the little less, and what worlds away!

Since a detailed comparison of the play and Lodge's story has been made by others,² I shall call attention only to the larger features. In some cases I shall use only Shakespeare's names for the characters.

All the important lines of action in the play are taken from Lodge. The enmity between the Dukes, the quarrel between Orlando and Oliver, the love-affairs of Orlando and Rosalind, of Oliver and Celia, of Silvius and Phebe, are all borrowed.

Let us glance at a few striking differences between the source and the play. Shakespeare cuts off years of time at the outset of the story, beginning with the quarrel between Orlando and his brother. He presents a single, definite quarrel and its results, while in Lodge there are three outbreaks of hostility between the brothers, the first two being followed by feigned reconciliations. In Lodge, Rosader (Orlando), though the younger son, is his father's favorite, and receives a larger share of the property than either of his brothers. Shakespeare suppresses this partial justification for the envy of Oliver. In Shakespeare, Duke Frederick and the banished Duke Senior are brothers. The corresponding characters in Lodge are nowhere said to be brothers, and we do not see how the intimacy between Rosalind and Alinda (Celia) was brought about.

In Lodge, the usurping King banishes Rosalynde, and then in a fit of anger because his daughter defends Rosalynde against his unjust accusations, banishes his daughter also. In Shakespeare, Celia's unselfish devotion to Rosalind and her voluntary decision to go into banishment with her cousin, are attractive elements in the story, and the search for the missing Celia is used to advance the plot. Because of a suspicion that Orlando has helped to spirit off the missing girls, a demand is made upon Oliver that he produce his brother. Thus Oliver finds his own fate bound up with that of Orlando.

² Delius, N. "Lodge's Rosalynde und Shakspeare's As You Like It," *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, VI (1871), 226-49.

Stone, W. G. "Shakspeare's As You Like It and Lodge's Rosalynde Compared," *Transactions New Shakspeare Soc.*, 1880-85, Part II, 277-93, 25*, 31*.

Orlando decides for himself to wrestle with Charles. In Lodge, much less effectively, Saladyne (Oliver) suggests to his brother that he take part either in the tournament at court or in the wrestling match. The attempt of Rosalind and Celia to dissuade Orlando from the wrestling is new to Shakespeare. This shows them in a pleasing way, and gives a natural opportunity for Rosalind and Orlando to see something of each other. The new feature that Orlando's father when living was a warm friend of Rosalind's father, and that Duke Frederick is unfriendly to Orlando for this reason, makes Rosalind's kindness to the young wrestler natural and maidenly. She is somewhat bold at this point in Lodge's story.

The play shows good taste in giving Rosalind as Ganymede the rôle of brother to Aliena; in the story she is Aliena's page. In Lodge, Rosader (Orlando), when lost in the forest of Arden, becomes faint and discouraged, but is cheered and roused up by the aged Adam. Shakespeare makes Orlando play the man throughout.

In the story, Rosader (Orlando) lets the banished girls wander off to Arden and makes no attempt to serve them. When he himself reaches Arden and meets Gerismond (Duke Senior), he informs that exiled monarch that his daughter and her dear friend Alinda (Celia) have been banished from court. This fact makes frankly incredible the failure afterward of both Rosader and Gerismond to recognize Rosalynde. The absence of recognition is difficult enough in the play, but at least Orlando and Duke Senior know nothing of the banishment of the girls, and never dream that they can be in Arden.

I shall not compare in detail the story and the play. Delius and Stone have done this with thoroughness and discrimination. My special purpose at this point is to ask whether any of Shakespeare's departures from Lodge's form of the story, or omissions of material there found, are of doubtful value or even unwise. This question has not been frankly considered. It is easier to endorse and praise the great dramatist. But Shakespeare does not greatly need our endorsement.

In Lodge, just after Rosader (Orlando) has read his elaborate poem describing the beauty of Rosalind, we have the following bright bit of fencing of which the play makes no use:

"Believe me," quoth Ganymede, "either the forester is an exquisite painter, or Rosalynde far above wonder; so it makes me blush to hear how women should be so excellent, and pages so unperfect."

Rosader beholding her earnestly, answered thus:

"Truly, gentle page, thou hast cause to complain thee wert thou the substance, but resembling the shadow content thyself; for it is excellence enough to be like the excellence of nature."

"He hath answered you, Ganymede," quoth Aliena, "it is enough for pages to wait on beautiful ladies, and not to be beautiful themselves."

"O mistress," quoth Ganymede, "hold your peace, for you are partial. Who knows not but that all women have desire to tie sovereignty to their petticoats, and ascribe beauty to themselves, where, if boys might put on their garments, perhaps they would prove as comely; if not as comely, it may be more courteous."³

Rosalynde-Ganymede plays with reality here in a fascinating way. It seems as if Shakespeare might well have borrowed some of this daring irony.

Having determined that everything in this play shall be 'as you like it,' Shakespeare cannot follow Lodge in making the usurping King meet death in battle, fighting to retain his ill-gotten dominion. Instead of this, the usurper in Shakespeare, coming at the head of a troop to put his good brother to the sword, meets "an old religious man," and "after some question with him" is converted "both from his enterprise and from the world." He becomes a religious recluse and bequeaths the crown "to his banished brother." There has been no adequate preparation for this easy solution. This turn of affairs is really absurd, the high-water mark of extravagant romanticism in the entire play.

Does not Shakespeare make a decided mistake in dropping Adam out of the play as soon as Orlando and he are welcomed to the forest by Duke Senior? In Lodge, Adam rejoices at the later reconciliation between the estranged brothers Rosader and Saladyne (Orlando and Oliver), and his rejoicing would have added a pleasing element to the play. In the romance, Adam is also remembered and rewarded at the close. Delius may well be right in saying that the old man is crowded out because Shakespeare has so many lines

³ Baldwin's ed. of *Rosalynde*, Ginn, pp. 56-57; Furness' ed. of *As You Like It*, pp. 348-49.

of action to follow. We shall soon see also that Shakespeare has added two farther lines of interest to the five stories which he took over from the prose romance. But is not this failure to keep the faithful Adam in mind an example of a trait which Shakespeare displays elsewhere, an inability to appreciate the power with which he has made a character appeal to us? In similar fashion, there is no mention of the faithful Fool at the close of *King Lear*, and the high-hearted boy Mamillius is forgotten at the close of *The Winter's Tale*. Each of these has died during the progress of the play concerned, but Adam is not disposed of in any way. A possible explanation of the difficulty is that the actor taking the part of Adam was too important to be kept for that rôle, which would necessarily be a minor one after Adam and Orlando reach the forest. It is interesting to remember that a credible tradition represents Shakespeare himself as taking the part of Adam.⁴ Rowe declares that "the top of his performance" as an actor was "the Ghost in his own *Hamlet*." The two rôles are distinctly similar; both are old-man parts; each has but a small number of lines; each calls for good judgment, impressiveness, dignity.

Swinburne calls the betrothal of Oliver to Celia "that one unlucky slip of the brush which has left so ugly a little smear in one corner of the canvas."⁵ But in Lodge, Saladyne (Oliver) bravely rescues the "fair shepherdess, Aliena" (together with Rosader and Ganymede), from a band of rascals who "thought to steal her away, and to give her to the king for a present; hoping, because the king was a great lecher, by such a gift to purchase all their pardons."⁶ The play as we have it is so crowded that we cannot wonder that this incident was omitted entirely. Nevertheless, we wish that Shakespeare had made Oliver in some way bring forth fruits meet for repentance before being rewarded with the charming Celia.

I have always wondered that Shakespeare made no use of the passage in Lodge where Ganymede urges Rosader (Orlando) to give up his vain love for Rosalynde and woo the beautiful Aliena.

"How say you by this item, forester?" quoth Ganymede, "the fair shepherdess [Aliena] favors you, who is mistress of so many flocks. Leave

⁴ Furness' edition, 129 f.

⁵ *A Study of Shakespeare*, Chatto, p. 152.

⁶ Baldwin, 83; Furness, 362.

off, man, the supposition of Rosalynde's love, when as watching at her you rove beyond the moon, and cast your looks upon my mistress, who no doubt is as fair though not so royal; one bird in the hand is worth two in the wood: better possess the love of Aliena than catch furiously at the shadow of Rosalynde."⁷

But Rosader is faithful to the Rosalynde whom he supposes to be far away.

Imagine Julia Marlowe as Ganymede making this suggestion to Orlando in an off-hand, careless manner, at the same time watching him sharply in order to learn the real state of his affections. A telling contrast between the real and the assumed feelings of Rosalind-Ganymede would thus come to expression in a most interesting way. Did not the dramatist neglect here a thrilling situation, a notable opportunity for intense acting?

Not content with the five lines of action borrowed from Lodge, Shakespeare adds to these a striking character-interest, that of Jaques, and the mating of Touchstone and Audrey. Although the melancholy Jaques has nothing to do in the play—and does it—he is a fortunate addition. His pungent comments upon those about him and on human life relieve the general tone of sugary romanticism. "So mysterious and attractive is this character," says Furness, "that, outside of England at least, Jaques has often received a larger share of attention than even Rosalind." But the very fact that he really does nothing in the play, and that the nature of his past life and the reason for his being in Arden are not clearly brought out, makes it difficult to understand his character. Furness comments thus upon the varied interpretations of this enigmatic fellow:

"With the sole exception of Hamlet, I can recall no character in Shakespeare of whom the judgments are as diverse as of this 'old gentleman,' as Audrey calls him. Were he really possessed of all the qualities attributed to him by his critics, we should behold a man both misanthropic and genial, sensual and refined, depraved and elevated, cynical and liberal, selfish and generous, and finally, as though to make him still more like Hamlet, we should see in him the clearly marked symptoms of incipient insanity."⁸

Is Jaques an invention of Shakespeare, or one more borrowing?

⁷ Baldwin, 62; Furness, 351.

⁸ Variorum ed. of *As You Like It*, p. vi.

Professor E. E. Stoll has demonstrated in an admirable paper that Jaques was suggested by the character Malevole, the Malcontent, the title-hero of John Marston's play *The Malcontent*.⁹

I summarize very briefly a portion of the action of *The Malcontent*. Altofronto, the former Duke of Genoa, has been banished by a usurper. He has returned to Genoa in disguise and lives there as Malevole, the Malcontent. While waiting and watching for a chance to regain his former power, he utters cynical comments upon those about him and their doings. Because he is considered a little beside himself, and not amenable to ordinary rules, he is not held responsible for his bitter speeches. The usurping Duke, unsuspecting, tolerates the unknown railer, though declaring that "his speech is halter-worthy at all hours." At the close Malevole seizes his rightful dukedom and rewards his friends, especially his faithful and long-suffering wife.

In this play there is a remarkable power of biting epigram, particularly in the speeches of the Malcontent himself. I cite two examples:

Pietro. . . . There is no faith in man.

Malevole. In none but usurers and brokers; they deceive no man: men take 'em for blood-suckers, and so they are.

IV, iv, 20 ff.

Emilia. . . . How many servants [lovers] thinkest thou I have Maquerelle?

Maquerelle. The more, the merrier. 'Twas well said, use your servants as you do your smocks; have many, use one, and change often.

IV, i, 57 ff.

Marston's character Malevole is organic, central to his play; Shakespeare's Jaques is an entirely superfluous person, much as we enjoy him. I will not repeat the details of Stoll's convincing argument, except to note that the close of *As You Like It* plainly copies the more fitting close of *The Malcontent*. I quote some of the last lines of Shakespeare's play. They are spoken by Jacques.

[*To the Duke*.] You to your former honor I bequeath,
Your patience and your virtue well deserves it:
[*To Orlando*.] You to a love that your true faith doth merit:
[*To Oliver*.] You to your land and love and great allies:

⁹ "Shakespeare, Marston, and the Malcontent Type," *Modern Philology*, III, 281-303, especially 281-88.

[To *Silvius*.] You to a long and well-deserved bed:
 [To *Touchstone*.] And you to wrangling; for thy loving voyage
 Is but for two months victuall'd. So, to your pleasures;
 I am for other than for dancing measures.

V, iv, 192-199.

At the close of *The Malcontent*, Altofronto, the restored Duke of Genoa, announces the destiny awaiting each important character. In his mouth this announcement has real fitness; but Jaques has no natural right or power to determine the fate of his companions. Stoll says justly: "Like Malevole, after a fashion unique in Shakspeare, and in keeping only with a duke or sovereign, Jaques portions off their lot of weal or woe to the various persons of the drama."¹⁰

The characters Touchstone, Audrey, and William, and the story of the mating of Touchstone and Audrey, are entirely new to *As You Like It*. There is no reason to doubt that this element of the play is of Shakespeare's own invention. Furness asks concerning Touchstone:

"Is the 'clownish fool' and the 'roynish clown' of the First Act, with his bald jests of knights and pancakes, the Touchstone of the Fifth Act, who has trod a measure, flattered a lady, been politic with his friend and smooth with his enemy? Is the simpleton of the First Act, 'Nature's natural' as he is in truth, the same with the Touchstone who can cite Ovid and quarrel in print, by the book? Are there not here two separate characters?"¹¹

These questions seem to me over-refined. In the second scene of the play a Clown enters, summons Celia to her father, and perpetrates the jest about the pancakes. In the next scene, when Rosalind and Celia plan to seek out the banished Duke in the forest of Arden, Rosalind proposes that they "steal the clownish fool out of your father's court" to "be a comfort to our travel." It is entirely uncalled for, and something that no practical dramatist would think of, to make the Touchstone who actually accompanies the girls on their journey to Arden a different person from the "clownish fool" whom they planned to take with them,

¹⁰ P. 283. Friedrich Radebrecht, *Shakespeare's Abhängigkeit von John Marston*, Cöthen, 1918, does not take up the question of the indebtedness of *As You Like It* to Marston.

¹¹ P. 309.

or different from the Clown of the second scene. Miss Porter is probably right in suggesting that when Celia in the second scene calls the "Clown" a "whetstone" sent by Nature to sharpen the dull wits of herself and her cousin, Shakespeare is thinking of the Clown's name Touchstone.¹²

George Bernard Shaw says derisively: "And then Touchstone, with his rare jests about the knight that swore by his honor they were good pancakes! Who would endure such humor from any one but Shakespeare? An Eskimo would demand his money back if a modern author offered him such fare."¹³

Shakespeare's treatment of this character of his own invention seems to me somewhat wavering and uncertain. In the third scene of the play Touchstone is conceived as a faithful fellow, entirely true to his kind mistress Celia, who says of him:

He'll go along o'er the wide world with me.

This seems like a preliminary study for that marvel of characterization, the bitter-sweet Fool of *King Lear*.

But how shall we interpret Touchstone's affair with Audrey in the latter part of the play? Does he love her? Gervinus and Boas hold that he intends to cast her off at a convenient season. Has the faithful one become faithless? "He seems" to Gervinus "equally devoid of the morality of either town or country." At the close of the play Jaques says to Touchstone:

And you [I bequeath] to wrangling; for thy loving voyage
Is but for two months victuall'd.

What weight shall we give to this cynical prophecy? I prefer not to press these words, but simply to say with Maginn that Jaques "cracks upon Touchstone one of those good-humored jests to which men of the world on the eve of marriage must laughingly submit."¹⁴ However, I feel that Shakespeare uses Touchstone to secure comic effects without very much regard to consistency.

John D. Rea believes that the introduction of Jaques and the "group of fools and rustics who furnish material for his melancholy philosophizing" was suggested to Shakespeare by Erasmus'

¹² *As You Like It* in the *First Folio Edition*, Crowell, p. 121.

¹³ *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, vol. II, 119. N. Y., 1913.

¹⁴ Furness, p. 284.

celebrated *Praise of Folly*. This book was "intended to show the folly of the professional wise men by contrast with the real wisdom of those usually accounted fools." Touchstone is one of these wise fools.¹⁵

I have already accepted Stoll's view concerning the origin of Jaques. The parallels pointed out by Rea between the satire of Erasmus and the play of Shakespeare may well indicate some indebtedness, but no element of the plot can come from Erasmus.

The reader may well think that the seven interests already named, six of them actions, make up the entire play. But they do not. The charm of the forest life is also an important interest. Three of the scenes have no reason for being in the play except that they help to suggest a breezy woodland existence. In the first of these, Act II, Scene i, Duke Senior praises the fellowship and even the rigors of the forest life:

Now, my co-mates and brothers in exile,
Hath not old custom made this life more sweet
Than that of painted pomp?

In Act II, Scene v, the song "Under the greenwood tree" begins with this favorite line taken from the Robin Hood ballads.¹⁶ Act IV, Scene ii, with its song over the dead deer, contributes to the woodland atmosphere. Moreover, all the more characteristic scenes of the play have a forest setting, or speak bewitchingly of life in the greenwood. The first scene of the play introduces this element in words of unforgettable charm:

Oliver. Where will the old Duke live?

Charles. They say he is already in the forest of Arden, and a many merry men with him; and there they live like the old Robin Hood of England. They say many young gentlemen flock to him every day, and fleet the time carelessly, as they did in the golden world.

Professor R. G. Moulton even terms the life in Arden Forest a "Woodland Action."¹⁷ This unusual expression indicates the importance of this element of the play.

Three short folk-plays dramatizing well-known ballads about

¹⁵ "Jaques in *Praise of Folly*," *Modern Philology*, xvii (1919), 465-69.

¹⁶ See, for example, the second stanza of *Robin Hood and the Monk*, No. 119 in *Child's English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, 1882-98.

¹⁷ *Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist*, 3d ed., Clarendon Press, 1893, p. 415.

Robin Hood have come down to us, two of them unfortunately incomplete.¹⁸ There can be no doubt that the Robin Hood ballads are one source for the setting of this play of life in the open.

Professor A. H. Thorndike, following a suggestion of Fleay,¹⁹ holds that Shakespeare was led to dramatize Lodge's pastoral and forest story of *Rosalynde* in 1599, when it was already nine years old, by the success of the two Robin Hood plays of Munday and Chettle, *The Downfall of Robert Earl of Huntington* and *The Death of Robert Earl of Huntington*.²⁰ These were acted in 1598 by Henslowe's Company, and "were successful enough to be given at court in the Christmas season" of that year. Thorndike finds that "in the years 1597-1600, pastoral plays were especially popular on the London stage." "In dramatizing a popular novel," says Thorndike, Shakespeare "introduced scenes presenting a picture of life already familiar on the stage—or, to put the case boldly, he added a Robin Hood element to *As You Like It* in rivalry of Robin Hood plays then being acted at an opposition theatre." Here, then, as in various other cases, Shakespeare followed the lead of other men, but produced a far superior result.

This claim of Thorndike may well be correct; I believe that it is. However, the case is more an example of Shakespeare's alchemy than of his indebtedness. What he 'borrowed' from these preceding plays is largely something that was not there, except in intention. Schelling says truthfully: "Munday and Chettle totally failed in reproducing the atmosphere of Sherwood Forest that breathes through the [Robin Hood] ballads."²¹

George Bernard Shaw sneers at *As You Like It*, a play for which he has an extreme dislike. He terms Rosalind "a fantastic sugar doll," and he makes the strange suggestion that the title of the play was given in a spirit of ill-humor as a stinging satire. He holds "That Shakespeare found that the only thing that paid in the theatre was romantic nonsense, and that when he

¹⁸ The best edition is in Manly, *Specimens of the Pre-Shakespearean Drama*, Ginn, I, 279-288.

¹⁹ See *The Life and Work of Shakespeare*, London, 1886, p. 208.

²⁰ "The Relation of *As You Like It* to Robin Hood Plays," *Journal of Germanic Philology*, IV, 59-69. The two plays mentioned are reprinted in Hazlitt's Dodsley, 1874, vol. VIII.

²¹ *Elizabethan Drama*, II, 154.

was forced by this to produce one of the most effective samples of romantic nonsense in existence—a feat which he performed easily and well—he publicly disclaimed any responsibility for its pleasant and cheap falsehood by borrowing the story and throwing it in the face of the public with the phrase ‘As You Like It.’”²²

The contention that the dramatist was consciously conforming to the popular taste in this play is probably correct; but there is no reason to think that in doing this he was in a bad humor.

That Shakespeare shows special contempt for *As You Like It* “by borrowing the story” is a surprising suggestion. As a rule his plays were derived from sources that we know. I cannot go into details, but it is probable that *Love’s Labour’s Lost* and *A Midsummer-Night’s Dream*, both written early in his career, are the only plays of the dramatist that are to be looked upon as presenting stories which are largely of his own invention. The manner in which he manipulates and supplements the material derived from his sources is, therefore, a fundamental subject of study in estimating aright the genius of Shakespeare. This topic is especially interesting in the case of *As You Like It*.

ALBERT H. TOLMAN.

The University of Chicago.

NOTES ON BURNS AND ENGLAND

It is becoming more and more the fashion to recognize Burns’s interest in and debt to England, despite the fact that his critics and biographers, for many decades after his death, did their best to establish the “entirely Scottish” theory which we now realize to be unfounded on fact.¹ That Burns owed much to the vernacular tradition established by the Sempills, Hamilton of Gilbertfield,

²² *The London Daily News*, April 17, 1900, p. 12, kindly lent me by Professor Archibald Henderson. See also Shaw’s *Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, N. Y., 1907, II, 116-22.

¹ For examples of characteristic criticism emanating from north of the Tweed, see Jeffrey’s and Scott’s reviews of Cromeke’s *Reliques*, in the *Edinburgh Review* for Jan. 1809 and the *Quarterly* for Feb. 1809, respectively; also Carlyle’s comments (1828) and Lockhart’s (1838). Later, when source-study was becoming fashionable, Principal Shairp, Stevenson, John Stuart Blackie, and a good many others only less influential contributed

Ramsay, and Fergusson, no one would deny. Equally true is it that he owed much—how much, indeed, no one knew till the *Centenary Burns* appeared,—to the unknown authors of Scottish song. But constant iteration of this fact will never establish the full truth of Burns's literary relationships, unless it be the case that his debt to other than Scottish writers was so slight as to be negligible. I think it can be shown that Burns was closer to the English literary tradition of his day than has been generally recognized; so close, indeed, that until one realizes how much more he was than the last of the vernacular school, one can understand neither the man nor his work.

Consider first Burns's use of the English language. As President Neilson has pointed out, the old idea that Burns wrote well only in Scots, is not in accord with the facts. Many of his best-known, most characteristic, and most poignant verses are pure English. In his letters, where there is virtually none of the vernacular, one finds more evidence of his mastery of English. It has long been the fashion—we seem to have taken the cue from Carlyle—to belittle these prose relics, and to point to their stilted phraseology as proof that Burns was ill at ease in the Southron tongue. But I think that a very few minutes' reading will convince anyone that the artificiality of phrase which cumbers so many of the pages is certainly to be ascribed to Burns's attempt to master an "epistolary style" utterly foreign to him, and not to the language. Indeed, when one passes over the Sylvander-Clarinda correspondence, and the many letters to persons above the poet in social rank, and turns to those, say, to Thomson, or Mrs. Dunlop, one finds him writing simply and effectively, and with a command of the language which shows how far wrong he was in speaking of English as a foreign tongue. It was as much his own as the "braid Scots" of "Tam." Indeed, when once or twice he writes a letter in the vernacular, it is an obvious *tour de force*.² And the fact that in 1787 most

to the development of the dogma. South of the boundary Matthew Arnold and W. E. Henley are only two of many who have commented on the "Scottishness" of Burns, and have helped build up the idea that not only is his literary ancestry predominantly Scottish, but that his good work is to be found only in the dialect poems.

² See for instance the letter to William Nicol, 31 May 1787; *Scott Douglas*, iv, 243.

intelligent lowland Scotsmen could have written English prose as readily as Scottish, and would hardly have thought of using anything else in correspondence, does not lessen the importance of the too often forgotten fact that Burns had excellent control over this medium of expression.

Another connection with England appears in the books from which Burns formed his taste for reading. John Murdoch, the boy's first tutor, lists as "the books most commonly used in the school,"³ the Spelling-book, the Bible, Mason's *Collection of Prose and Verse*, and Fisher's *Grammar*. Gilbert Burns adds the following to the list begun by Murdoch:⁴ *The Complete Letter Writer*, Richardson, Fielding, Smollett, Pope, Addison, *The English Collection* (Mason's collection, referred to by Murdoch), and Fenelon's *Télémaque*. On this same matter hear the poet himself: "The earliest thing of composition I recollect taking pleasure in was 'The Vision of Mirza,' and a hymn of Addison's. . . . The first two books I ever read in private, and which gave me more pleasure than any two books I ever read again, were 'The Life of Hannibal,' and 'The History of Sir William Wallace.'"⁵ A little later in the same letter Burns acknowledges his debt to the *Spectator*, Pope, Shakespeare, Locke, Boyle, Ramsay, and the *Select Collection of English Songs*, which is generally supposed to have been *The Lark*, 1751. Again he writes, "My reading was enlarged with the very important addition of Thomson's and Shenstone's works. . . . I had met with a collection of letters by the wits of Queen Anne's reign, and I poured over them devoutly. The addition of two more authors to my library gave me great pleasure; Sterne and Mackenzie—'Tristram Shandy' and 'The Man of Feeling'—were my bosom favorites. . . . My reading was only increased by two stray volumes of Pamela, and one of Ferdinand Count Fathom, which gave me some idea of novels. Rhyme, except for some religious pieces which are in print, I had given up; but meeting with Fer-

³ Scott Douglas, IV, 346.

⁴ "Narrative by Gilbert Burns"; *S. D.* IV, 352 ff.

⁵ Autobiographical letter to Dr. Moore, *S. D.* IV, 4 ff. The first of the two books mentioned was probably Rowe's life of Hannibal (1737); the second was Hamilton of Gilbertfield's modernized (1722) English version, in orthodox couplets, very different from the old Scots poem.

gusson's Scotch Poems, I strung anew my wildly-sounding rustic lyre with emulating vigor."⁶

This reference to Fergusson's influence on the young Burns has been often commented on, and no one would question its significance, though the direct influence of Fergusson was hardly in proportion to the magniloquence of Burns's phraseology. But at the same time that one notes Burns's enthusiasm for his predecessor's work, one should also remember that his early books were chiefly English books, that he grew up in an atmosphere where English influences were at work on him, and that these English influences were, according to his own word, very considerable.

When, later in life, it was Burns's privilege to buy books, one finds him still turning to England. Thus on July 18, 1788, he orders Smollett and Cowper from his friend Peter Hill of Edinburgh.⁷ Again, on April 2, 1789, from the same book-seller, Shakespeare and a Johnson's Dictionary.⁸ A year later the following are on his lists: Otway, Jonson, Dryden, Congreve, Wycherley, Vanbrugh, Cibber, Macklin, Garrick, Foote, Coleman, and Sheridan.⁹ More evidence of the same sort could be added, if more were needed, to show his continuous interest in English literature.

Look at the question from another angle. What sort of incidental allusions, quotations, references, does one find in Burns's letters? Does he seem, judged by these *obiter dicta*, to be interested chiefly in Scottish literature? Quite the contrary. If one were to estimate Burns by his letters alone, one would think of him as a man who wrote Scottish songs because he liked to, but who knew eighteenth century English letters far better than Scots, and esteemed them more highly. Thus we find him alluding, in a manner which indicates a considerable degree of familiarity with the person named, to Addison, Cowper, Fielding, Goldsmith, Gray, Johnson, Mackenzie, "Ossian," Pope, Shenstone, Smollett, Sterne, Young, and to various periodicals, notably the *Spectator* and *Rambler*.¹⁰ Of the English poets whose work did not fall within the somewhat uncertain limits of the eighteenth century he refers to Donne, Shakespeare, Milton, and Spenser. All in all, Burns

⁶ *S. D.* iv, 151.

⁷ *Ibid.* 225.

⁸ *S. D.* v, 140.

⁹ *Ibid.* 304.

¹⁰ Not all these persons are English by nativity, but all belong to the English tradition. I omit the dramatists already listed.

knew a good deal of English literature, and it is obvious that he knew much of it rather well.

In this connection it may be interesting to point out that among the whole list of English poets the following are his favorites, if we may judge by the frequency of allusion: Thomson, Shakespeare, Young, Milton, "Ossian," and Shenstone. Among the prose writers Mackenzie and Sterne are mentioned most often, and both may fairly be included in the list of non-Scottish influences. Obviously Burns was right when he said, "My favorite authors are of the sentimental kind, such as Shenstone . . . Thomson, Mackenzie, Sterne, Ossian. . . . These are the glorious models after which I endeavour to form my conduct."¹¹ He might have written, "Of the sentimental and English kind."¹²

¹¹ *S. D.* iv, 41.

¹² Parenthetically, I question whether it has ever been pointed out how thorough-going a sentimentalist Burns really was. Critics have noted his fondness for Mackenzie, the obvious sentimentalism in the *Clarinda* correspondence, and in many of the poems. In the letters to Mrs. M'Lehose, indeed, he seems at times almost to have been writing with a volume of Sterne open before him. Thus on June 25, 1794, he says: "Here I am set, a solitary hermit, in the solitary room of a solitary inn, with a solitary bottle of wine before me"—as near as his conscience would allow to Sterne's "one solitary plate, one knife, one fork, one glass." This, to Miss Wilhelmina Alexander, 18 Nov. 1786, can hardly be matched outside of Sterne: "It was a golden moment for a poetic heart. I listened to the feathered warblers, pouring their harmony on every hand, with a congenial kindred regard, and frequently turned out of my path, lest I should disturb their little songs, or frighten them to another station. Surely, I said to myself, he must be a wretch indeed, who, regardless of your harmonious endeavour to please him, can eye your elusive flights to discover your secret recesses, and rob you of all the property nature gives you—your dearest comforts, your helpless nestlings. Even the hoary hawthorne twig that shot across the way, what heart at such a time but must have been interested in its welfare, and wished it preserved from the rudely browsing cattle, or the withering east?" (*S. D.* iv, 160). In 1794 he writes to George Thomson, apropos of the heroine of "Craigieburn Wood": "The lady on whom it was made is one of the finest women in Scotland; and in fact (*entre nous*), is, in a manner, to me, what Sterne's Eliza was to him—a Mistress, or Friend, or what you will, in the guileless simplicity of Platonic love." (*S. D.* vi, 311. The lady in question was Jean Lorimer.) He was in truth a disciple of Parson Yorick; in addition to the women for whom his passion was much more than sentiment, there is a long list of the adored ones for whom he was forced to limit his

If Burns's prose furnishes good evidence of his interest in English letters, it might be supposed that it would make equally clear that debt to Scottish poetry which has been so often commented on. This, however, is not the case. To begin with, the total number of references to Scottish vernacular literature is slight; of the old "makars" he mentions Barbour, "Blind Harry," and James I, but not in a way that indicates any actual familiarity with their works. Once he refers to "Scotland's Complaint." Of the more recent poets, those with whom he had more in common, he mentions Fergusson rarely but enthusiastically, Ramsay fairly often, and his own contemporaries, whom he calls "Scottish poetasters, . . . ill-spawned monsters,"¹³ two or three times. There are, of course, many references to Scottish song, and a number to the traditional ballads, which were neither Scottish nor English, but both. But on the whole the allusions to Scottish vernacular poetry are surprisingly few.

Again, one finds that by comparison with the large number of references to English poetry, Burns's comments on Scottish literature appear more negligible than they really are. Thus Ramsay, whom he seems to have known best among the Scots, figures in the correspondence less than half as often as Thomson.

Of course no one would suggest that the influence of these two poets can in any final sense be determined by the frequency of Burns's allusions to them. But I am convinced that such facts as these I have been trying to set forth, though not contradicting the old idea of a profound Scottish influence on the poet, make it

affection to what Sterne calls that "tender and delicious sentiment which ever mixes in friendship where there is a difference in sex." But Burns's sentimentalism went deeper than mere imitation of Sterne. He had persuaded himself, through the exercise of his reason, as he thought, that the emotions and not the intellect should be the guide of life; he believed in the perfectibility of mankind: "I am in perpetual warfare with that doctrine of our reverend priesthood that 'we are born into this world bond-slaves of iniquity and heirs of perdition, wholly inclined to that which is evil.' . . . I believe in my conscience that the case is just quite contrary." Thus he at least approaches the position of the philosophical sentimentalists of the mid-eighteenth century. But this of Burns's sentimentalism is of itself a large question. I mention it now only to add a little evidence of his interest in eighteenth century English thought.

¹³ *S. D.* v. 215.

certain that he was more interested in English literature than has been generally recognized.¹⁴

FRANKLYN B. SNYDER.

Northwestern University.

THE RIMES OF STEFAN GEORGE

Although the battle over the significance of Stefan George in the development of the modern German lyric has not yet been ended, some critics such as Zwymann¹ and Lewisohn² calling him the greatest living lyricist, and others again such as Koch³ and Grummann⁴ styling him a mere *poseur* and euphuist,⁵ there is

¹⁴To the discussion of Burns's relations to England W. P. Ker has made an interesting contribution in the *Scottish Historical Review* for October, 1917. He points out that Burns had a great interest in history, but that he preferred English to Scottish, and that at the very time he was writing his most "Scottish" poems he was busily studying English history. Professor Ker further alludes to the fact that poems by Burns appeared in the *Annual Register*, and that Burns published both prose and verse in the *London Star*. The "Address to the Deil" and the "Dedication" are in the *Register* for 1787 (publ. 1789). The list of poems sent to London is not long, but is more considerable than Professor Ker indicates. (To Peter Stuart's *Star* Burns sent the "Ode Sacred to the memory of Mrs. Oswald," "On the Duchess of Gordon's Reel-Dancing," "Ode on the Departed Regency Bill," "A New Song for the Kilmarnock Chapel," and the song, "Anna, thy Charms." To Mayne's *Star* he sent "The Whistle." To Lloyd's *Evening Post* went the "Elegy on the Departed Year"; to *St. James's Chronicle* the "Prologue for the Dumfries Theatre"; to the *Morning Chronicle* "Lines on a Banknote"; and to the *Gentleman's Magazine* the "Address to the Shade of Thomson." (For data, see notes to the *Centenary Burns*, under titles listed.)

¹ Kuno Zwymann, *Das Georgesche Gedicht*, 1902.

² Ludwig Lewisohn, *The Spirit of Modern German Literature*, 1915.

³ Vogt-Koch, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, II, 3d ed., 1910.

⁴ Paul H. Grummann in *The German Classics*, XVIII, 288-289.

⁵ Personally, I can not judge George as highly as Lewisohn or Zwymann, his admirer, who goes so far as to speak of the poet's readers only as *die Geniessenden*, nor, on the other hand, can I agree with Grummann, who makes him out to be almost a rank charlatan. A more unbiased opinion probably lies between these two extremes, for a poet who resorts to such striking artificialities and externalities as George does in order to frighten off *die Allzuvielen* can not be counted among the greatest artists, while,

general agreement that he is a master of form, the disagreement centering around the question as to how far his remarkable formalistic finesse will prove salutary and reformatory. In brief space I propose to consider one phase of George's formalism—his rimes—, my study being based upon his more recent and mature work *Der siebente Ring*.⁶

An examination of *Der siebente Ring* with regard to rime shows the following:—

1. George is not, in his more recent work, noticeably abandoning the rimed couplets *abab*, *aabb*, and *abba* in favor of the unrimed pentameter, as Taylor Starck's article⁷ might suggest. To be sure, there is a considerable number of unrimed pentametric poems in the *Ring* (they comprise about 60 pages out of approximately 200), but this is due, it seems, more to the nature of the subject-matter treated than to any change in George's style.

2. Attention has rightly been called to George's remarkable facility for re-introducing into the language archaic forms, some of which have been out of use for centuries, and for using unusual words and words hitherto not found in German poetry. It is worth noting that a large percentage of these words, also of George's unusual compounds, is found at the end of a riming line, introduced for the manifest purpose of the rime, it being George's theory that a given rime should be used by a poet only once or at most seldom. And it appears that it is precisely this theory which contributes to the difficulty of George's language, compelling him, as it does, ever to seek new riming material. It is my distinct impression that as soon as George stops riming, and writes blank verse, he becomes less obscure, although his manner remains the same. Some of the obsolete and unusual words, as well as words hitherto not found in German poetry, used in the riming syllables of the *Ring*, together with the words with which they rime, are:—*erdenriefen*—*sternentiefen* (51);⁸ *kafiller*—*fosforschüller* (51); *spille*—*stille* (51); *höhtet*—*rötet* (55); *sprenkel*—*schenkel* (58); *befelden*—*helden* (63); *schrunde*—*kunde* (73); *schrunde*—

on the other hand, his remarkable steadfastness of purpose and fidelity to ideals throughout thirty years stamp him as more than a mere *poseur*.

⁶ 2d ed., Georg Bondi, Berlin, 1909.

⁷ *M. L. N.*, January, 1919.

⁸ The numbers refer to the pages of the 2nd ed. of the *Ring*.

stunde (146); *reffen*—*treffen* (80); *trestern*—*gestern* (88); *gefistel*—*mistel* (74); *sode*—*tode* (90); *swiseseln*—*kiesel* (91); *jug*—*zerschlug* (91); *zugewunken*—*funken* (107); *glinstern*—*finstern* (110); *glosen*—*rosen* (111); *fodre*—*lodre* (115); *seime*—*keime* (119); *eppich*—*teppich* (121); *gestaupt*—*haupt* (128); *arven*—*harfen* (135); *schlüften*—*lüften* (142); *gemässe*—*gefässe* (147); *ranft*—*sanft* (159); *schwaden*—*laden* (169); *brüsche*—*büsche* (174). George is especially fond of *ge*-compounds, which he derived to some extent directly from the Middle High German. Among the more unusual ones in the *Ring* are:—*gekrös* (used also by Schiller), *getön*, *geweide*, *geschmetter*, *gespinn*, *geschwele*, *geraum*, *geleucht*, *gestühl* (used also by J. H. Voss), *gebäu*, *gezüchte*, *geflimme*, *gewinde*, *gekling*, *geduft*.

3. Beside those rimes mentioned above, George finds many unusual ones in more usual words, some of them extremely bold and rarely used by predecessors. They are the rule in his lyrics, not the exception. Some of them are:—*zerriss*—*zerspliss* (63); *tiegel*—*spiegel* (78); *bitternisse*—*risse* (79); *firmamente*—*langgetrennte* (70); *siebten*—*geliebten* (109); *drommete*—*flehete* (114); *makel*—*mirakel* (114); *maser*—*faser* (119); *lack*—*strack* (120); *karneol*—*lebewohl* (126); *zinnober*—*oktober* (132); *gekicher*—*dämmerlicher* (132); *pachtung*—*umnachtung* (178); *dunkel*—*karfunkel* (151); *plane*—*enziane* (134). Taken out of their context, some of the more extreme rimes border on the ludicrous, but, of course, they never create this impression upon the serious reader of George.

4. That George is a consummate master of perfect rime, easily the equal of Platen and superior to Liliencron, can not justly be denied. The only instances of imperfect riming which I have found in the *Ring* are *umsonst*—*sonnst* (103); *weit*—*geweiht* (136); *lust*—*verlust* (177), but these cases may be intentional, for sometimes George deliberately lets words rime with themselves, as on pages 77, 104, 156 and 162. The rime *nächste*—*ärzte* (103) is undoubtedly pure in the poet's pronunciation. Rarely does George allow the endings *-ung* and *-heit* alone to make a rime (*schwung*—*vergöttlichung*, 113; *felsensprung*—*dämmerung*, 131; *trunkenheit*—*bereit*, 137); usually the rime includes more (*weiten*—*ewigkeiten*, 113; *erscheinung*—*einung*, 118; *dämmerungen*—*durchdrungen*, 121). Rime extending over two or more

words is also rare (*pocht er—tochter*, 107; *weht es—beetes*, 160; *klings es—beschwingt es*, 157). An unusual phenomenon is *grau und silbern—blau und silbern* (107). So conscientious a purist is George with regard to rime that even such rimes as *dräut—beut* (117) and *hain—wein* (56), involving diphthongs of different spellings, seem to be shunned wherever possible. Cases of internal elision of a vowel, usually *e*, for the sake of the rime, are rare (*loh'n—tron*, 52; *ruft—schuft*, 53). The *e* of the present infinitive is omitted or inserted in accordance with the requirements of the meter, often omitted (*wehn—sehn*, 111; *benedein—befrein*, 111; *lehn—geschehn*, 105; but *erkoren—geboren*, 105; *dorren—verworren*, 89).

5. George seems to make a point of riming the oblique cases of nouns frequently (*stückes—glückes*, 33; *wahnes—spanes*, 50; *krampfe—dampfe*, 50); he also likes to rime different parts of speech, often in inflected form (*verschneiten—gezeiten*, 89; *takte—nackte*, 168; *scheins—eins*, 175; *verderbst—herbst*, 175).

6. In a few instances the poet uses semi-rimes, probably for the purpose of creating a folk-song impression. A good example of this practise is *Der Widerchrist* (56), where *garn—horn*; *reich—leicht*; *schein—seim*; *trog—hof* are apparently used as quasi-rimes. Another instance is found on page 183.

7. George uses both masculine and feminine rimes with equal facility, but he seems to have a predilection for the feminine type, as it affords him more freedom for practising his great rime skill.

8. Complicated rime schemes, such as the one used on page 161 (*abcadcefbdf*), are not frequent.

9. Internal rimes are rare in the *Ring*. The poem *Litanei* (148) may be quoted as an example of such riming.

Quite apart from the question of their literary value, there can be no doubt that for the student of lexicology, metrics and rime the lyrics of Stefan George will some day offer a fruitful field of investigation.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL.

Washington, D. C.

CHAUCER'S PROLOGUE, 1-7

Two passages in Boethius' *Consolation* may throw further light upon Chaucer's thoughts of the relationship between Zephyr and the arrival of new life in spring:

Whan that Aprille with his shoures sote
The droghte of Marche hath perced to the rote,
And bathed every veyne in swich licour,
Of which vertu engendred is the flour;
Whan Zephirus eek with his *sweete breeth*
Inspired hath in every holt and heeth
The tendre croppes (A, 1-7.)

Skeat, in his note on line 5, tells us that there are two references to Zephyrus in Chaucer's translation of Boethius—in Book I, metre 5, and Book II, metre 3. In his note on the word "croppes," he refers a second time to the translation of Boethius—to Book III, metre 2, line 24. But the idea of consulting the Latin original of Chaucer's translation for relations to the Zephyrus-breeth-tendre-croppes passage in the *Prologue* seems not to have occurred to Skeat.

Let us look, then, at the two Boethian passages to which Skeat first makes reference and at the two passages which Chaucer has translated from them:

Tua uis uarium temperat annum,
Ut quas boreae spiritus aufert,
Reuehat mites zephyrus frondes;
Quaeque arcturus semina uidit,
Sirius altas urat segetes. (Lib. I, met. v, 18-22.)

Thy might atempreth the variaunts sesons of the yere; so that *Zephirus the deboneir wind bringeth ayein, in the first somer sesoun, the leues* that the wind that highte Boreas hath reft away in autumpne, that is to seyn, in the laste end of somer; and the sedes that the sterre that highte Arcturus saw, ben waxen heyne cornes whan the sterre eschaufeth hem. (I, m. 5, 14-20)

Cum nemus flatu zephyri tepentis
Vernis inrubit rosis,¹
Spiret insanum nebulosus auster;
Iam spinis abeat decus. (Lib. II, met. iii, 5-8.)

¹ Professor A. S. Cook has anticipated me in a study of lines 5-8 of Lib.

Whan the wode wexeth rody of rosene floures, in the first somer sesoun, thorough the brethe of the winde Zephyrus that wexeth warm, yif the cloudy wind Auster blowe felliche, than goth away the fairenesse of thornes. (II, m. 3, 7-10.)

Now just what is it that these four passages, Latin and English, tell us about the breath of Zephyr and the tender crops? They tell us in the first place that Chaucer had studied over two passages of Boethius and that, in his translation of them, he had thought of the breath of Zephyr as a thing which brought back life *in* or *into* the leaves of the vernal season. In the first passage he was conscious that the *spiritus* (= 'spirit' or 'breath') of Boreas carried off the leaves "in autumpne" and that the wind Zephyr brought those leaves back "in the first somer sesoun." It is clear that he did not think that the wind blew the dead leaves up from the ground to grow again on the trees; he thought rather that Zephyr caused new foliage to shoot upon those trees,

Ut quas boreae spiritus aufert,
Reuchat mites zephyrus frondes.

In the second passage he was conscious of a wood,—or, to paraphrase, of a *holt*,—that waxed "rody of rosene floures, in the first somer sesoun," because of the breath (= *flatu*) of Zephyr blowing warm upon it.

Cum nemus flatu zephyri tepentis
Vernis inrubit rosis.

It is apparent, then, that Chaucer, some years before he wrote the *Canterbury Tales*,² had known from Boethius³ a wind, Zephyr, the *spiritus* or *flatu* of which inspired the springtime. It is, I believe, that latter sort of wind that appears in the first lines of the *Prologue*.

But the Latin passages do not stop there. They have something to tell us in the second place also. That is that one of them offers

II, met. 3, in connection with line 5 of the *Prologue*. See his "Chaucerian Papers," *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, XXII, 1-63.

² The *Prologue* of the *Canterbury Tales* cannot date before 1386-1387. See Skeat, III, 372.

³ The translation from Boethius dates from 1377-1383. See Skeat, II, vii.

a very close parallel to the "tendre croppes" of Chaucer. Let us observe this:

Ut quas . . . *spiritus* aufert,
Reuehat *mites zephyrus frondes*.
(Lib. I, met. v, 19-20.)

Whan Zephyrus eek with his swete
breeth
Inspired hath in every holt and
heeth
The tendre croppes . . . (A, 1-7.)

The Middle English words "tendre croppes" offer a most logical and acceptable translation of the Latin words "*mites . . frondes*"! Like the latter they are equally applicable to the new shoots that appear on the tiniest shrub or on the mightiest oak. It is true that *Harpers' Latin Dictionary* does not specifically offer "tendre" as a translation for "*mitis*," and true that the first given literal meanings of that word—*mild, mellow, mature*—refer to the softness that accompanies ripeness rather than budding; but it is obvious that the softness referred by Boethius to the word "*mitis*" is a softness in new foliage ripening from bud to mature leaf in the spring, advent of which under a Zephyrian influence he is describing, rather than a softness of autumn leaf or fruit. It is, beyond question, such a softness that Chaucer is thinking of in his "tendre croppes," inspired in every holt and heath by "Zephyrus."

So much for "tendre."

Brief comment upon the word "croppes," or upon its singular form "crop," will also be relevant.

In the singular or in the plural it was used commonly, according to the evidence of the *NED.*, in the Middle Ages and in the Fourteenth Century to define the top of a herb or flower or plant; that is to say, in a sense hardly different from its application in our own times, as we think of the top parts of plants which we harvest. Gower, who uses the word but twice, uses it most clearly once in this sense:

The lilie croppes on and on,
Wher that thei weren sprongen oute,
He smot of, as thei stode aboute. . .

(*Confessio Amantis*, VII, 4678-80.)

Chaucer, according to the evidence of Skeat's glossary, uses the word seven times. In two places it means distinctly the tops of trees: *Romaunt of the Rose*, 1396; *Book of the Duchess*, 424. In one place it rather apparently means the tops of trees: A, 1532.

In three places it may refer as much to the heads of plants as to the heads of trees: *Boethius* III, m. 2, 23; *Troil.* II, 348 and v, 25. The seventh instance of its use is the one in the *Prologue*, line 7.

In the singular the word is used by Chaucer most distinctly to mean tree-top in that passage of his translation of *Boethius* to which Skeat refers us in his note on line 7; that is, in Book III, metre 2. For convenience we may quote again from Chaucer's translation and from *Boethius'* Latin:

The yerde of a tree, that is haled a-doun by mighte strengthe,
boweth redily the *crop* a-doun; but yif that the hand of him that
it bente lat it gon ayein, anon the *crop* loketh upright to hevene.
(III, m. 2, 22-25)

Validis quondas uiribus acta
Pronum flectit uirga cacumen:
Hanc si coruans dextra remisit,
Recto spectat uertice caelum.

(Lib. III, met. 2, 27-30.)

Here obviously "crop" is Chaucer's translation of "cacumen," a word which can offer neither confirmation nor refutation of the very close resemblance, previously instanced, of "tendre croppes" to "mites . . frondes": so that further discussion of it is unnecessary.

To conclude, however, it is clear that the two Boethian passages first quoted must be taken into the reckoning when students of Chaucer try to find analogies to parts of the poet's description, in the early lines of the *Prologue*, of the first influence of spring upon nature. The second of the two makes its appearance in that connection, I believe, here for the first time.

ADDENDUM

With further reference to A, 5-7, Professor Lowes, in his article in *Modern Philology*, xv, 689 ff., is disposed to consider it as offering a very close verbal resemblance to a brief excerpt from Boccaccio's *Filocolo*. The excerpt which Professor Lowes quotes from the Italian is as follows:

Come quando Zeffiro soauemente spira si sogliono le tenere
sommita degli alberi muouere per li campi. (*Filocolo* II, 239 (Ed. Moutier))

Translated literally this passage yields, 'When Zephyr breathes softly the tender tree-tops are wont to sway in the fields.' There is no explicit thought in it that the warm breath of the wind is a force in nature that produces growth in the bud which results in the shooting out of new and tender foliage on shrub and tree. And we may well question if there is an implicit thought to that effect. I believe (unless the most conclusive proofs are found to show that Chaucer knew and read the *Filocolo*) the text of Boethius will block all the apparent force of Professor Lowes' parallel.

(1) Boethius' *flatu zephyri tepentis* (Lib. II, met. 3, 5) offers as good a parallel as Boccaccio's *soavemente spira* to Chaucer's *with his swete breeth*. The Latin says only warm breath; the Italian only soft breath.

(2) His *mites . . frondes* (Lib. I, met. 5, 21) is a closer parallel to Chaucer's *tendre croppes* than is Boccaccio's *tenere sommita degli alberi*. For Boethius' term, like Chaucer's, is equally applicable to new and tender growth on shrub and tree, while Boccaccio's can refer to tree-tops only.

(3) Boethius' view of the function of Zephyr coincides with Chaucer's view in the *Prologue* no less than in the translation from the *Consolation*.

(4) Furthermore it is plain that whatever force of resemblance may lie in the word "spira" of the *Filocolo* passage it is offset by the presence of "spiritus" in the first Boethian passage studied above (i. e., in Lib. I, met. 5, 19), and of "spiret" in the second (i. e., Lib. II, met. 3, 7).

I may add that neither in this connection nor elsewhere in his article has Professor Lowes shaken my belief that we have no adequate evidence for believing that Chaucer was acquainted with the *Filocolo*, a belief that was presented in my dissertation on *The Indebtedness of Chaucer's Works to the Italian Works of Boccaccio* (The University of Cincinnati Studies, 1916).

HUBERTIS CUMMINGS.

The University of Cincinnati.

VAUGHAN'S INFLUENCE UPON WORDSWORTH'S POETRY

On reading Vaughan's *Retreat*, one is at once struck with similarity between that poem and Wordsworth's *Ode, Intimations of Immortality*. Investigation of Vaughan's poetry as a source of Wordsworth's thought and inspiration does not seem to have gone farther than a mere passing comment that there is a great likeness between the two poems, and that Vaughan's poem probably inspired the other.

The resemblance between the *Retreat* and the *Ode* is, indeed, quite remarkable. Each poem opens with a description of the world as it appears in beauty to the child. Then, as the child grows up to manhood, there comes the gradual absorption of the spirit in the consideration of the material things of life, though now and then come the haunting memories of childhood, when all things appeared in the "glory and freshness of a dream." Although the substance of the two poems is much the same, they differ quite a little in their conclusions. Wordsworth is thankful that he has kept alive within him something of that spiritual vision of childhood, and that nature, with all its beauties, still means much to him. Though Vaughan's poem may be regarded as not so profound in its philosophy as Wordsworth's, and inferior as an artistic creation, yet he gives us what is lacking in the *Ode*,—a hope of returning again to the joy of childhood. Professor Reed, in commenting on the poems, says: "In its simpler meter, its quieter manner, its quainter diction, the *Retreat* seems nearer to that age of innocence which both poets celebrate."

The similarity of the two poems is not in general content alone, but there is a singular likeness in the lines which does not seem to be merely the accidental result of treating the same subject. Vaughan's poem begins:—

Happy those early days, when I
Shin'd in my angel infancy!
Before I understood this place

¹ Edward Bliss Reed, *English Lyrical Poetry*, New Haven, 1914.

Appointed for my second race,
Or taught my soul to fancy aught
But a white celestial thought.

These same ideas are separated in Wordsworth's poem. In section I we find:

There was a time when meadow, grove and stream,
The earth and every common sight,
To me did seem
Apparelled in celestial light.

In section IX:

. those obstinate questionings
Of sense and outward things,
Fallings from us, vanishings;
Blank misgivings of a Creature
Moving about in worlds not realized.

Vaughan, in speaking of the soul's progress through life, says:—

When yet I had not walked above
A mile or two from my first love,
And looking back—at that short space—
Could see a glimpse of His bright face.

In the *Ode* we find:—

The Youth, who daily farther from the east
Must travel, still is Nature's Priest,
And by the vision splendid
Is on his way attended.

Wordsworth rejoices

. . . that in our embers
Is something that doth live,
That nature yet remembers
What was so fugitive!

Vaughan felt

. . . through all this fleshly dress
Bright shoots of everlasting guess.

Wordsworth closes his poem with these exquisite lines:—

To me the meanest flower that blows, can give
Thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears.

Vaughan expresses a similar thought when he says:

When on some gilded cloud, or flow'r,
 My gazing soul would dwell an hour,
 And in those weaker glories spy
 Some shadows of eternity.

A like idea appears too in Wordsworth's line:

..... the hour
 Of splendor in the grass, of glory in the flower.

The ideas which Wordsworth has seemingly borrowed from Vaughan for his *Ode* do not appear in the *Retreat* alone, but the same thoughts occur in several of the earlier poet's works. The idea of the celestial light dying away, appears in Vaughan's *Man's Fall and Recovery* and in *The Pursuit*.

When one reads the opening lines of Vaughan's *Corruption*:

..... Man in those early days
 Was not all stone and earth;
 He shin'd a little, and by those weak rays
 Had some glimpse of his birth.
 He saw heaven o'er his head, and knew from whence
 He came, condemned, hither . . .

there is found a remarkable resemblance to Wordsworth's words:

Not in entire forgetfulness
 And not in utter nakedness
 But trailing clouds of glory do we come
 From God who is our home.

In the *Excursion* (Book 9, l. 1, et seq.) we have Wordsworth's theory of nature. To him, Nature meant something more than the mere outward world or the universe. It was Life, Soul, God. He looked upon matter as being animated by Spirit,—an "active principle" which "subsists in all things." Similar ideas are to be found in Vaughan's *Come, What Do I Here?*, *Christ's Nativity* and *The Dawning*.

In *Regeneration* and in *The Waterfall*, Vaughan presents the idea of the beneficent, ethical influence of nature upon human life, an idea which Wordsworth strove to inculcate in the "Song at the Feast of Brougham Castle."

Wordsworth regarded every separate thing as having a soul from Nature:

A spirit and a pulse of good
 A life and soul to every mode of being
 Inseparably linked. (*The Cumberland Beggar*, l. 77 et seq.)

But not only did he regard every separate thing as having a soul from Nature, but each place as having a special character. This idea he presents in "Hart Leap Well" in which he shows Nature manifesting her disapproval of man when he seeks his pleasure at the expense of suffering on the part of one of its unoffending members. This idea he may have gathered from some of Vaughan's lines in *The Stone*.

Hence sand and dust
 Are shak'd for witnesses, and, stones,
 (Which some think dead, shall all at once
 With one attesting voice detect
 Those secret sins we least suspect.
 For know, wild men, that when you err
 Each thing turns scribe and register,
 And, in obedience to his Lord,
 Doth your most private sins record.

Many of the ideas of Wordsworth's *The World is too much with us* may be found in Vaughan. In the following lines, from *Religion*, we have the idea of God, Nature, speaking less and less to man:—

My God, when I walk in those groves
 And leaves, Thy Spirit doth still fan,
 I see in each shade that there grows
 An angel talking with a man.

Nay Thou Thyself, my God, in fire,
 Whirlwinds and clouds, and the soft voice,
 Speak'st there so much, that I admire
 We have no conf'rence in these days.

Is the truce broke? or 'cause we have
 A Mediator now with Thee,
 Dost Thou therefore old treaties wave,
 And by appeals from Him decree?

Or is't so, as some green heads says,
 That now all miracles must cease?
 Though Thou hast promis'd they should stay
 The tokens of the Church, and peace.

In Vaughan's *Rules and Lessons* there is the Wordsworthian thought that "heaven's gate opens when this world's is shut," and advice is given how to live that we do not become too materialistic:—

Walk with thy fellow-creatures: note the hush
And whispers amongst them. There's not a spring
Or leaf, but hath his morning-hymn. Each bush
And oak doth know I AM.

When the world's up, and ev'ry swarm abroad,
Keep thou thy temper; mix not with each clay:
Dispatch necessities; life hath a load
Which must be carri'd on, and safely may.
Yet keep those cares without thee, let the heart
Be God's alone, and choose the better part.

If the third, fourth and fifth stanzas of Vaughan's *Distraction* be read before the first and second, making the poem begin, "The World is full of voices," a marked resemblance to Wordsworth's *The World Is Too Much With Us* will at once be observed:

Distraction

O knit me, that am crumbled dust! the heap
Is all dispers'd and cheap;
Give for a handful but a thought,
And it is bought;
Hadst Thou
Made me a star, a pearl, or a rainbow,
The beams I then had shot
My light had lessen'd not;
But now
I find myself the less the more I grow.

The world

Is full of voices; man is call'd, and hurl'd
By each; he answers all,
Knows ev'ry note and call;
Hence, still
Fresh dotage tempts, or old usurps his will.
Yet hadst Thou clipp'd my wings, when coffin'd in
This quicken'd mass of sin,
And saved that light, which freely Thou
Didst then bestow,
I fear
I should have spurn'd, and said Thou didst forbear:
Or that Thy store was less:

But now since Thou didst bless
 So much,
 I grieve my God! that Thou hast made me such.

A greater familiarity with all of Wordsworth's work instead of some few of his most famous poems, without doubt would show many more similarities in the ideas and compositions of these two men. One marked difference, however, in their work should be noted, and that is the Christian sentiment which pervades nearly all of Vaughan's writings, and which does not appear in Wordsworth's. Indeed, the dedication of Vaughan's *Silex Scintillans* is "To my most merciful, my most loving, and dearly loved Redeemer, the ever blessed, the only Holy and Just one, Jesus Christ."

Not only in these selections does there seem to be ample evidence that Wordsworth was familiar with Vaughan's poetry, but additional proof is to be found in the statement of Archbishop Trench to Grosart, that among Wordsworth's books there was a much-thumbed copy of Vaughan's poems. That Wordsworth possessed such a book Grosart verified by consulting a catalogue of the poet's books which were offered for sale, in which he found Vaughan's *Silex Scintillans* listed.

L. R. MERRILL.

New Haven, Conn.

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY PROSODY: *HIER*; *FLÉAU*;
MEURTRIER; *FUIR*

In an article entitled *les Innovations prosodiques chez Corneille*¹ M. Philippe Martinon has given the results of the most detailed study that has been made of Corneille's influence on French prosody. While reading plays in the period which he treats, I noticed a number of cases that are not altogether in accord with his statements. This was, of course, to be expected, for one cannot cover the whole field of seventeenth-century verse. My remarks will serve merely to add a few notes to an article that remains in most respects a model for this kind of research.

1. *Hier*. M. Martinon states that this word was monosyllabic in Old French verse, usually dissyllabic in that of the sixteenth

¹ *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, 1913, pp. 65-100.

century, always dissyllabic in the seventeenth century before Corneille except "chez quelques ignorants ou quelques entêtés."² According to him, Corneille always made the word monosyllabic and it was owing to his influence that Mairet, Thomas Corneille, Quinault, La Fontaine, Molière adopted the monosyllabic count. Boileau and Racine, he adds, were among the first to "revenir à la vérité" and give the word two syllables. Now it is doubtless true that Corneille's influence was extremely important in making it generally possible to treat *hier* as a word of one syllable, but it is by no means sure that this influence was felt by Mairet, who counted the word as monosyllabic in his *Virginie*, II, 3:

Euridice hier encor me promet de sa bouche;

and while the *Galerie du Palais*, in which Corneille first used the word *hier*, may have been acted before *Virginie* was, it was not printed till 1637, two years after the publication of the latter play. It was also published a year later than Scudéry's *Mort de César*, in which I find again the monosyllabic count, "Hier au soir ennuyé."³ Moreover, Corneille did not succeed, even temporarily, in preventing the use of *hier* as a dissyllabic word. I find it so used, not only by Rotrou, who is the only one of Corneille's contemporaries mentioned by M. Martinon in this connection, but by the following authors: Beys, *Céline* (1637),⁴ III, 4; Guérin de Bouscal, *la Suite de la Mort de César* (1637), II, 2; La Caze, *l'Inceste supposé* (1639), IV, 6, "qui partageoit hier"; Sallebray, *le Jugement de Pâris* (1639), III, 6 and *la Troade* (1640), I, 3, IV, 1, V, 3; Mareschal, *le Capitaine Matamore* (1640), II, 5, "que d'hier seulement"; La Caze, *Cammane* (1641), I, 1; Saint-Germain, *Timoléon* (1641), II, 2; Sallebray, *l'Amante ennemie* (1642), V, 9, "depuis hier au soir," and *la Belle Egyptienne* (1642), V, 1,

Qu' hier ie combatois vos bontés justement;

Guérin de Bouscal, *la Mort d'Agis* (1642), IV, 3 and *le Fils désavoué* (1642), V, 4.

² One might thus explain an example from Théophile cited by Quicherat, *Traité de versification française*, Paris, Hachette, 1850, p. 297, "que vous ne fîtes hier."

³ V, last scene. I have consulted the second edition, that of 1637.

⁴ Dates in this article, unless it is stated otherwise, are those of publication.

Mais pourquoy donc hier m'aduouer ma naissance;

Du Ryer, *Dynamis* (1652), III, 4,

Et si mon entreprise estoit hier un crime;

Brécourt, *la Feinte Mort de Jodelet* (1660), I, 3,

Comment ma tante morte, et d'hier au cercueil.

These examples cover fairly well the period between the *Cid* and *Andromaque* and show that Racine and Boileau were far from being among the first to return to the dissyllabic treatment. Indeed, the two counts seem to have existed side by side during the last three-quarters of the century. The influence of Boileau and Racine was important as a counterbalance to that of Corneille, but it is a mistake to hold that the use of the word as dissyllabic had died out when they began to write.

2. *Fléau* was monosyllabic in the sixteenth century and at the beginning of the seventeenth century, as it is in the pronunciation of peasants in parts of France to-day.⁵ M. Martinon admits that exceptions to this usage occur in the works of Jean de la Taille and Alexandre Hardy,⁶ who make the word dissyllabic, but he argues that these were incorrect poets, who followed local pronunciations without expressing any special ideas about prosody. He finds only slight variations among literary authors, that Saint-Amant makes the word dissyllabic once, monosyllabic six times, and that Rotrou and Scarron use it in both ways. Then Corneille in *Attila* "adopta la diérèse, qui a prévalu depuis." But *Attila* was neither acted, nor printed till 1667. I find that the word had already been counted as dissyllabic, not only in such obscure plays as the anonymous *Mort de Roger* (1626), II, 3:

Fléau, dont le destin les monarques guerroye,

and the *Pasiphaé* that is attributed to Théophile:⁷

Que vos fléaux sur tous s'étendent icy-bas,

⁵ Especially in Normandy and in central France. Cf. *l'Atlas linguistique*, fascicule 13.

⁶ He cites no example. One is found in *Lucrece* (1628), reprinted by Stengel, Marburg, 1884, v, 190, "Ta louue, ton fleau, qui s'achemine icy."

⁷ I, p. 13 in the edition of Paris, Gay, 1862, a reprint of the edition of Paris, 1628.

but also in plays by regular contributors to the Parisian repertory, the important *Mariane* of Tristan l'Hermite (1637), II, 5:

Et trouue que pour moy, c'est vn fleau celeste;

the *Mauzolée* of Mareschal (1642), II, 6, "ce fleau de l'Etat"; and the *Porus* of Boyer (1648), II, 1:

A ce cruel fleau de tous les Potentats.

This dissyllabic treatment had, therefore, a certain amount of support long before *Attila*. Corneille merely added his influence to that of others.

3. *Meurtrier* has, perhaps, attracted more attention than any other word containing a consonant + *l* or *r* + *i* + a vowel. M. Martinon states the case as follows. Corneille had already made *romprions* a word of three syllables in *Mélite* (1633). In the *Galerie du Palais* (1637) he counted *baudriers* in the same way; similarly *meurtrier* in *Médée* and the *Illusion comique*. But these three plays were not printed till after the *Cid* (1637), so that the first examples of which we can be sure are in the latter play, where *meurtrier* occurs three times and is always a word of three syllables, as in the celebrated line,

Il est juste, grand roi, qu'un meurtrier périsse,

which the Academy condemned with the remark that "ce mot de meurtrier qu'il répète souvent le faisant de trois syllabes, n'est que de deux." Corneille continued to count it as a three-syllable word. Was he the first to do so and did his contemporaries make their usage coincide with his? M. Martinon asserts that "il est certain que, pas plus que pour *fuir* et *fui*, on ne suivit Corneille immédiatement."⁸ Now I find no case of diaeresis so early as the *romprions* of *Mélite*, but I do find trisyllabic *meurtrier* in plays printed earlier than the *Cid* or *Médée* and I can show that Corneille's usage was by no means peculiar in the period that followed the representation of the *Cid*.

As far as I have been able to determine, *meurtrier* as a word of three syllables first occurs⁹ in the *Jaloux sans sujet* of Beys (1635), II, 3, "meurtrier amoureux" and

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 91.

⁹ Not to mention such incorrect authors as Troterel, *Sainte-Agnès*, Rouen,

(Au moins beau meurtrier, contente mon enuie,

next in the *Cléopâtre* of Benserade (1636), III, 1:

Vous attendez la mort de ma main meurtrière.

The latter author in his *Gustaphe* (1637) makes it both dissyllabic (v, 3, "ce meurtrier inhumain") and trisyllabic (v, 7, "il est mon meurtrier"), but in his *Méléagre* (1641) only trisyllabic (v, 9, "et cette meurtrière"). Guérin de Bouscal, after treating the word three times as dissyllabic in *la Suite de la Mort de César* (1640), I, 1, 2 and III, 4, makes it trisyllabic two years later in *Sanche Panse*, III, 5, "sauver un meurtrier." Sallebray in his *Troade* (1640) makes it trisyllabic twice, III, 7, and dissyllabic three times, I, 1, 3, and 4. But in his *Amante ennemie* (1642) he gives only one example of the word as dissyllabic, I, 1, "le meurtrier de mon frere," four examples of it as trisyllabic, I, 2, "sur ce vieil meurtrier," II, 1, 2, and III, 2. Gabriel Gilbert makes it trisyllabic in his *Hypolite* (1640), III, 2, "du meurtrier d'un fils,"¹⁰ and Desfontaines follows his example in his *Sémiramis* (1647),¹¹ "je suis sa meurtrière." Corneille was, therefore, by no means alone in this reform, though he is one of the few authors of his generation who never made the word dissyllabic.

4. *Fuir*. M. Martinon states that before Corneille the infinitive and the past participle of this verb were treated as dissyllabic, though in other verb forms *fui-* was considered a single syllable. The earliest example he finds in print of *fuir* or *fui* counted as a monosyllabic word occurs in Corneille's *Veuve* (1634), for Rotrou's *Ménechmes*, which also contains an example, though probably acted earlier than *la Veuve*, was not published till 1636. I find as early a case of it in de Rayssiguier's *Palinice, Circeine et Florice*,¹² IV, 2:

1615, reprinted at Paris, Librairie des Bibliophiles, 1875, p. 95, "Meschante meurdrière!" and Discret, *Alizon* (1637), reprinted by Fournier, *Le Théâtre français au XVIe et au XVIIe siècle*, II, 344, "car la main meurtrière."

¹⁰ I find in his *Sémiramis* (1647), v, 2, "le meurtrier execrable," which is evidence, perhaps, that this play, though published after *Hypolite*, was written before it.

¹¹ Cited by the frères Parfaict, VII, 158.

¹² 1634. The *achevé d'imprimer* is not given.

Pour l'amour de vous seul ie le veux fuir aussi.

M. Martinon's statement, which I have quoted, that Corneille was not followed at once, should be modified in the light of examples from Du Ryer's *Clarigène* (1639), II, 5, "C'est lacheté de fuir";¹³ Rotrou's¹⁴ *Antigone* (1639), III, 1, "Se fuir après au gré des vents," and *Crisante* (1640), III, 2, "Pour la fuir et devoir n'en être pas avare"; Guérin de Bouscal's *Cléomène* (1640), III, 4; and Boyer's *Porcie romaine* (1646), I, 3, "peut bien fuir comme luy."

In all four cases the count which Corneille adopted coincided with the pronunciation of at least a considerable proportion of his contemporaries. M. Martinon has shown that he was quick to follow contemporary speech and absolutely consistent in his prosody. But he was not necessarily the first to make the changes I have discussed, nor was his the only influence that led to the general acceptance of the usage to which he adhered.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

CHATEAUBRIAND ET L'ABBÉ C. F. PAINCHAUD

Dans ses *Souvenirs d'un demi-siècle, ou Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire contemporaine*, Montréal, 1885, l'historien canadien Joseph-Guillaume Barthe raconte comment, alors qu'il était encore enfant, il s'arrêta, en 1835, au cours d'un voyage sur le Saint-Laurent, à Sainte-Anne Lapocatière et y rencontra l'abbé C. F. Painchaud, fondateur du collège de Sainte-Anne et ancien missionnaire à la Baie des Chaleurs. D'après Barthe, l'excellent abbé qui jouissait à cette date d'une véritable célébrité pour l'éloquence de ses sermons et surtout pour la façon pathétique et émouvante dont il chantait les hymnes sacrés, lui aurait communiqué sur le séjour de Chateaubriand au Niagara des documents d'une impor-

¹³ In his *Argénis* (1631), I, 2, "pourquoy fuir si viste?" and in his *Alcionée* (1640), IV, 3, "à fuir de moy mesme," Du Ryer made the infinitive dissyllabic. The change shown in *Clarigène* (1639) tends to support my theory that the latter play was written after *Alcionée*, though printed before it. Cf. my *Pierre Du Ryer, Dramatist*, Washington, 1912, p. 90.

¹⁴ Edition of Paris, Desoer, 1820.

tance capitale. On pourra en juger par ce passage que nous détachons du récit de Barthe:

"Mais pour en revenir au supérieur de Sainte-Anne, il était homme du monde, à son heure, comme s'il avait été élevé pour la cour. Avec cela nature superbe, joviale et sympathique au possible, littérateur et même poète. Il nous fit confidence d'une petite joute de ce genre qu'il avait eue avec non moins que Chateaubriand lui-même, à Niagara, où il avait eu le bonheur de couler une semaine auprès de lui, et dont il avait consigné les pièces justificatives dans son album, délicieux de forme et de fond, qui faisait le plus précieux ornement de son salon, fort bien décoré du reste, par des tableaux de famille et des objets d'art variés qui accusaient à la fois la délicatesse et la diversité de ses goûts."¹

On aperçoit du premier coup la valeur qu'offrirait un document de ce genre si nous pouvions le retrouver, et quel intérêt pour l'histoire littéraire présenterait le procès-verbal des conversations que Chateaubriand aurait eues chez les sauvages de Niagara avec le bon missionnaire. J'ai tout d'abord été d'autant plus tenté d'accepter le témoignage de Barthe que j'y trouvais l'explication d'un passage du *Génie du Christianisme* qui depuis longtemps m'intriguait.

On se souvient peut-être comment, dans le *Génie*, Chateaubriand raconte qu'il a rencontré un apôtre chrétien "dans les solitudes américaines." "Un matin, je cheminais lentement dans les forêts, j'aperçus venant à moi un grand vieillard à barbe blanche et vêtu d'une longue robe, lisant attentivement dans un livre et marchant appuyé sur un bâton; il était tout illuminé par un rayon de l'aurore. . . . C'était un missionnaire de la Louisiane: il revenait de la Nouvelle-Orléans et retournait aux Illinois, où il dirigeait un petit troupeau de Français et de sauvages chrétiens. Il m'accompagna pendant plusieurs jours. . . . Ce saint homme avait beaucoup souffert; il racontait bien des peines de sa vie; il en parlait sans aigreur, et surtout sans plaisir, mais avec sérénité. . . . Il citait agréablement et souvent des vers de Virgile et d'Homère, qu'il appliquait aux belles scènes qui se succédaient sous nos yeux, ou aux pensées qui nous occupaient. Il nous parut avoir de vastes connaissances en tous genres, qu'il laissait à peine aper-

¹ Barthe, p. 101.

cevoir sous sa simplicité évangélique. . . . Nous eûmes un jour une longue conversation sur la Révolution française, et nous trouvâmes quelques charmes à causer des troubles des hommes, dans les lieux les plus tranquilles. Nous étions assis dans une vallée, au bord d'un fleuve, dont nous ne savions point le nom, et qui, depuis de nombreux siècles rafraichissait de ses eaux cette rive inconnue. . . . (*Génie du christianisme*, iv partie, liv. iv, ch. viii).

Pour qui connaît les procédés de composition de Chateaubriand, la facilité avec laquelle il fond différentes scènes en une seule et réunit des événements séparés de plusieurs jours ou de plusieurs mois, les contradictions que l'on peut relever entre son récit et la note de Barthe n'ont tout d'abord rien d'alarmant. Qu'il ait transporté au bord d'un fleuve inconnu une scène qui, dans la réalité, se serait passée au Niagara, qu'il ait transformé en vieillard à barbe blanche un homme alors jeune, puisqu'il vivait encore en 1835, qu'il ait même entièrement transformé la géographie, il n'y aurait rien là que de naturel et d'habituel chez lui. L'essentiel, et ce qui semble bien ressortir des deux récits, c'est qu'il aurait bien rencontré, quelque part dans les solitudes américaines, un missionnaire avec qui il aurait eu de longues conversations. A tout le moins, et sans pousser l'enquête plus avant, on pourrait semble-t-il, trouver dans le récit de Barthe une preuve de plus que Chateaubriand est bien allé au Niagara et y a séjourné un certain temps.

Il restait cependant un dernier point à établir, le plus important. Qu'était devenu le précieux album dans lequel l'abbé Painchaud avait consigné ses entretiens avec le futur auteur du *Génie du Christianisme*. Était-il possible de le retrouver après tant d'années? Les héritiers de l'abbé Painchaud, ou le bibliothécaire du Collège Sainte-Anne, s'étaient-ils bien rendu compte de sa valeur et l'avaient-ils conservé avec le soin que méritait un document de cette importance? Les recherches complémentaires que j'ai pu faire ne permettent malheureusement plus de laisser subsister aucun espoir de retrouver le procès-verbal des entretiens de l'abbé Painchaud et de Chateaubriand. Si le fameux album a pu exister, il ne renfermait certainement aucune pièce de ce genre, puisque l'abbé Painchaud s'il était déjà né au moment où Chateaubriand s'arrêtait à la cataracte n'avait à cette date que neuf ans.² Il n'a donc

² Pour la biographie de l'abbé Painchaud, consulter N. E. Dionne, *Vie de C.-F. Painchaud, prêtre, curé, fondateur du Collège de Sainte-Anne de la*

pu rencontrer Chateaubriand en Amérique et n'a pu se livrer avec lui à une joute oratoire et le récit de Barthe est manifestement faux.

Dans ces conditions, il semblait inutile de pousser l'enquête plus loin. Il restait cependant à déterminer qui, de Barthe ou de l'abbé Painchaud, s'était rendu coupable d'une inexactitude aussi flagrante et quelles circonstances avaient donné naissance à cette nouvelle légende sur Chateaubriand. Si le fameux album n'existe pas, et pour cause, par contre, les papiers de l'abbé Painchaud ont été conservés au Collège Sainte-Anne et c'est là que l'historien du bon abbé a pu les consulter pour rédiger sa biographie. Il ressort des pièces justificatives qu'il a publiées en appendice que l'abbé Painchaud, qui avait pour Chateaubriand l'admiration la plus vive a écrit à l'auteur du *Génie du Christianisme* et reçu de lui une lettre qu'il a pieusement conservée. C'est sans aucun doute cette correspondance qu'il a communiquée à Barthe en 1835 en même temps que le journal de ses voyages à la Baie des chaleurs, à la mission de Ristigouche et à la Tracadie. On ne peut se montrer trop sévère à l'égard de Barthe d'avoir à cinquante ans de distance, et sans aucun doute après avoir lu Chateaubriand, brouillé les dates et les faits et opéré une *contaminatio* qui risquait de lancer les chercheurs sur une fausse piste. Tout en aboutissant, en somme, à un résultat négatif, notre enquête n'aura pas été cependant totalement inutile, si elle nous a permis d'arrêter, alors qu'il en était encore temps, une nouvelle légende qui, grâce aux affirmations si positives de Barthe, aurait pu se propager.

D'autre part la lettre écrite par l'abbé Painchaud à Chateaubriand, le 19 janvier 1826, nous apporte un précieux témoignage sur la gloire dont jouissait à cette date au Canada l'auteur du *Génie du Christianisme*.³ "Ce pauvre Canadien inconnu," c'est ainsi qu'il s'intitule lui-même, qui a erré pendant huit ans chez les sauvages a versé d'abondantes larmes de religion et d'admiration à la lecture du *Génie*. "Je dévore vos ouvrages, dont la mélan-

Pocatière, Québec, 1894. Je tiens à exprimer ici toute ma reconnaissance à M. l'Abbé J. A. Nainfa, du Séminaire Saint-Sulpice de Baltimore, et à M. Auguste Boulet supérieur du Collège Sainte-Anne, qui m'ont signalé l'existence de cet ouvrage et m'ont si aimablement aidé pour tout ce qui suit.

³ Dionne, 373-376.

colie me tue, en faisant néanmoins mes délices; c'est une ivresse. Comment avez-vous pu écrire de pareilles choses sans mourir?" écrit-il à celui qu'il appelle l'homme de la Providence et à qui il offre, dans le cas où une nouvelle révolution le forcerait à quitter de nouveau sa patrie, "un feu clair, des eaux limpides, une peau de castor et un ciel bleu." Chateaubriand n'était plus à l'âge où l'on court les aventures et les solitudes du Nouveau-Monde; c'est avec la grandiose mélancolie qu'il aimait alors qu'il répond, un an plus tard, à l'invitation de son admirateur lointain. On nous permettra de reproduire sa lettre et de la signaler au savant éditeur de sa correspondance, M. Louis Thomas.

Paris, le 29 avril 1827.

Si la date de votre lettre est exacte, monsieur, ce n'est qu'après plus d'un an que cette lettre me serait parvenue; je n'ai donc pu avoir l'honneur de vous répondre plus tôt. Je ne mérite pas sans doute, monsieur, les louanges que vous voulez bien me donner; mais croyez que je suis infiniment plus touché des éloges d'un *pauvre curé* du Canada, que je ne le serais des applaudissements d'un prince de l'Eglise. Je vous félicite, monsieur, de vivre au milieu des bois; la prière qui monte du désert est plus puissante que celle qui s'élève du milieu des hommes; toute pour le ciel, elle n'est inspirée, ni par les intérêts ni par les chagrins de la terre; elle tire sa force de sa pureté.

Désormais, monsieur, les tempêtes politiques ne me jetteraient sur aucun rivage; je ne chercherais pas à leur dérober quelques vieux jours, qui ne vaudraient pas le soin que je prendrais de les mettre à l'abri; à mon âge il faut mourir pour le tombeau le plus voisin afin de s'épargner la lassitude d'un long voyage. J'aurais pourtant bien du plaisir à visiter les forêts que j'ai parcourues dans ma jeunesse, et à recevoir votre hospitalité.

Agréez, monsieur, je vous prie, avec mes remerciements, l'assurance de ma considération distinguée.

Chateaubriand.

GILBERT CHINARD.

Johns Hopkins University.

REVIEWS

Mystères et Moralités du manuscrit 617 de Chantilly. By GUSTAVE COHEN. [Bibliothèque du XV^e siècle, vol. xxv.] Paris: Champion, 1920. Pp. cxlix + 138.

Additions to the literature of the early French drama have been so rare in recent years and modern editions so few that one cannot but welcome a volume containing five hitherto unpublished old French plays, an early *Nativité*, a fragment of another *Nativité*, a *Moralité des sept Péchés Mortels et des sept Vertus*, a *Moralité de l'Alliance de Foy et Loyauté*, and a *Moralité du Pèlerinage de la Vie humaine*. The collection, written in a Walloon dialect conjectured to be that of the region north-east of Liège (p. cxlvii), emanates, as the editor has cleverly discovered (p. xcviif.), from a convent of the Dames Blanches de Huy, where some at least of the plays were performed. The manuscript is dated from the second part of the fifteenth century, but the plays in the opinion of the editor seem to belong, with the exception of the first *Nativité*, to the second half of the fourteenth (p. cxlviii).

The first *Nativité*, if one excludes the scene introducing two shepherdesses,¹ bears every evidence of being a very early play. The

¹ This scene is partly out of place in the MS. and paleographically distinct. The hypothesis (p. x) that the same scribe who is responsible for the rest of the play wrote it—*en des modules différents*—seems unlikely. The dissimilarity between I, ll. 1-98 (scribe A), 99-111 (B) and 112-121 (C) extends beyond the *modules*. A writes the article *unc*, B and C *ung*. A writes *nos* or *n^o*, *vos* or *v^o*, B only *no^o*, *vo^o*, C only *n^{os}*. A writes *enfan* seven times, never *enfant*, C only *enfant* (twice). A wrote "Chi aorent les pastore Et puis chantēt Glorieux dieu etc" which B crossed out, re-writing the same rubric later as "Chy adorent les pasteurs 7 puyz chantent glorieux dieu qⁱ fist."

It is also to be noted that the signatures of plays I and V, which induced the editor to adopt the theory that the whole MS. is the work of only two scribes writing in at least six different *modules* (p. x), are after all not identical. Remembering that the family Bourlet was "très liée à la vie du couvent" (p. xcix) and that Katherine's sister Ydon also entered it, is it not possible that the latter, or some other Bourlet, may have signed the first play? The question is not without importance for if, for example, I, ll. 99-121 are an addition to an earlier play, then discussions involving their vocabulary, assonances and date (pp. xvi, xxvi, lxxxiv, cxxv) should take cognizance of this possibility.

editor gives it (p. cxxi) a "double certificat de provenance liégeoise et d'ancienneté" and dates it (p. cxlviii) not later than the first half of the fourteenth century. His arguments, however, for connecting it with the liturgical Bilsen *Stella* and the vernacular *Paaschspel* are unconvincing. In the case of the Bilsen text, he apparently forgets at times that the antiphon *Hoc signum* on which he lays such stress (p. cxvii f.) is not present in the Bilsen *Stella*; he overemphasizes the importance of the agreement in the use of *offeramus* for the more usual *offerentes*, a slight, possibly scribal, detail; and he underemphasizes the relation of the new text to the Strasbourg, Limoges and Vatican texts in the position of the *Eamus ergo*, a structural matter.² In the case of the *Paaschspel*, the only significant resemblance is the presence of the *Hoc signum*, clearly a liturgical survival in both plays; the *Eamus ergo* occurs before the meeting with Herod in the *Paaschspel*, after it in the *Nativité*. In fact the Limoges text agrees with the *Nativité* more closely than either the Bilsen play or the *Paaschspel*, for it alone has all three of the distinguishing characteristics stressed by M. Cohen. In any event, however, the connection of this newly printed Nativity play with the liturgical drama cannot be questioned, and the editor is quite justified in stating (p. cxxxi) that its simplicity, sincerity and absence of comedy distinguish it from other early French plays on the subject.³

The second *Nativité*, fragmentary, later, and of less interest than the first, is nevertheless noteworthy for the appearance of a *Sot*, introduced as a sort of court jester to King Herod. Both these plays exhibit peculiarities of assonance and rhythm—if their eccentric *vers libre* can be called rythmical—that deserve further study.

The three moralities which follow gain such distinction as they

² The Vatican text is not mentioned, and to speak of the "usage tardif" of Limoges is misleading: whatever the date of the office, its form is primitive. There are several minor slips on this page (cxviii): for *Martenne*, read *Martène*; for *après que les rois ont quitté les Mages*, read *après que les Mages ont quitté le roi*. "Le manuscrit 178 d'Orléans" is now Bibl. de la Ville 201 (olim 178) and Paris Bibl. Mazarine ms. 1708 is attributed to saec. XI, not XIII, by its editor. On these points see K. Young, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxvii (1912), 68-70.

³ He says (p. cxxxii) that it is probably "la plus ancienne Nativité connue en langue vulgaire." The Spanish Three Kings play (*Auto de los Reyes Magos*) now dated by R. Menéndez Pidal (*Cantar de Mio Cid* [1908], p. 144) before the thirteenth century, is not mentioned.

possess from their literary and historical associations rather than from any intrinsic merits of their own. The first is an uninspired development of the *Psychomachia* type, but will be of considerable interest to students of the drama because it illustrates the intimate connections existing between the mediæval plays and their non-dramatic sources. M. Cohen rightly surmised that the words *Le miroir de vie . . . et de mort* in ll. 2527-8 "pourra servir à en découvrir la source," but the source itself eluded him. The play, however, is based upon a moral poem which is entitled *De vij pechies morteus*, or, *Li miroirs de vie et de mort* in the Bibl. Ste. Geneviève Ms. containing it (Ms. 2200 f. 164v-172v; it is briefly described by Mâle in *L'Art religieux du XIII^e siècle*, p. 145).⁴ The third morality printed by M. Cohen is also derived from a moral poem, the well-known *Pèlerinage de la vie humaine* by Deguillville, of which it is for the most part a direct translation. As the editor has flanked the play by two texts of the poem, written in fourteenth-century French and fifteenth-century Walloon, respectively, its linguistic and literary problems can be conveniently studied. The other morality included in the volume (Play iv) introduces an unusual pastoral element—the characters, Foy, Loyalté, Amour, etc. appear as shepherds and shepherdesses. In the opinion of the editor (p. cvii f.) the play may contain historical and social allusions, but, as he admits, their proper interpretation is attempted rather than achieved.

Unfortunately, the long Introduction discussing certain paleographical, linguistic, historical and literary aspects of the plays, despite its formal air of completeness and orderliness, leaves much to be desired. Philologists will be on their guard when they find (p. xix) *infer:siewy*, III, 2136-7 cited (and again p. xxxvii) as illustrating the reduction of *ie* to *i*, although it is clear from the text that *infer* is rhymeless and that *siewy* rhymes with *cy*, l. 2138; when in the group *ire:premiere:banier*, III, 207-9, it is assumed that l. 209 rhymes with 207-8; when such rhymes as *Sainte-Espire:vestire*, *cy:my*, *roïne:encline*, are described as "important" and

⁴Since writing this review I have learned, through the kind offices of M. Jeanroy and Dr. D. S. Blondheim, that M. Långfors has anticipated me in recognizing the relation of the play to the poem. M. Långfors' edition of the poem is to appear in *Romania*, where the subject will doubtless be fully discussed.

"characteristic"; when (p. lv) the second vowel in such words as *angele, ordene*, etc. is treated as "*protonique non initiale non en position*," etc. The justification for the plan of grouping together the rhymes and assonances "qui trahissent des prononciations identiques et cela sans égard ni à l'étymologie ni à la graphie" (p. xx) becomes obscure in the execution.⁵

The absence of a careful study of elision and hiatus in the Introduction has laid the texts under a needless burden of notes,⁶ and in many cases where the editor holds printed debates with himself in the footnotes no recognizable general principles appear to guide his decisions. It would seem, especially in play v, where the two texts of the *Pèlerinage* printed beside it usually suggest the correct reading, that the corrections obviously demanded should either have been introduced, properly indicated by brackets and parentheses, or omitted without further comment than that supplied by an introductory discussion.⁷ It is also to be regretted that, owing to

⁵ Thus among the "assonances et rimes en *ei*" (p. xxviii f.) one discovers such forms as *aveuglit : delit*, III, 79-80; *nettie (nettoyée) : deslechie (déliée)*, III, 2269-70 which is cited on p. lxxvii as attesting "la réduction de *ie* à *i*"; etc. The rhyme *vray : dyraie*, III, 59-60 is placed among the assonances and rhymes in *ei* (p. xxix), and *diraie : vray*, IV, 37-40 (read 37-8) among the assonances and rhymes in *ai, è, eal* (p. xxiv), while *seroie : voroye*, III, 1305-6 appears among the assonances and rhymes in *oi* (p. xli). Among the "assonances et rimes en *o*" which "ne sont explicables que si on les suppose en *o*" (xxxix-xl) are *jour : douleur*, III, 1635-6; *dolour : pleur*, III, 1641-2; *amor : solour*, III, 2297-8, and *Amor : labeur*, IV, 298-9, all four of which are also included (though similar examples are not) among the "assonances et rimes en *eul, eur, ure, our*" (xlv-xlvi), where considerable uncertainty is expressed regarding their pronunciation.

⁶ The discussions of the treatment of final *e* on pp. xiv, lv f., lxxii, are inadequate. Cf. e. g. the two statements on p. lvi: "Il faut en conclure probablement que l'*e* final, dès le XIV^e siècle et à la différence du français, ne se prononce plus. . ." and "La suppression de l'*e* muet s'effectue souvent aux dépens de la mesure. . ." What seems to have happened in these texts, if one may hazard a conjecture, is that since etymological final *e* was sometimes not pronounced, it was occasionally omitted without justification, and, on the other hand, an unetymological *e* was at times introduced, in accordance with the familiar phenomena of inverted ("umgekehrte") writing and pronunciation.

⁷ See such notes as III, 252, 312, etc; v, 29, 31, 81, 99, etc. and cf. e. g. III, 672 with 1175; III, 2019 with 2023, etc. The wisdom of suggesting elision by parentheses may well be questioned, but in any case the inde-

the general plan, hypotheses regarding the dates and authorship of the various plays, as well as references to the relation between the language of authors and scribes are scattered here and there through the Introduction in such a way as to render them practically inaccessible.

These are technical details, however, and for general students of the mediæval drama of less importance than the texts themselves. Here, then, they will find a miscellaneous collection of plays which were probably performed as well as transcribed by nuns, two of the plays early and characteristically Walloon in spirit as well as in form, two adapted with but few changes from non-dramatic moral poems and all worthy of study because of their provenance as well as their possible literary relations at home and abroad.

GRACE FRANK.

Baltimore.

A Survey of English Literature, 1780-1880. By OLIVER ELTON.
New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920. Four vols.

The first two of the four imposing volumes of Professor Elton's new work appeared in 1912, have therefore been subjected to their share of reviewing, for the most part favorable, and have already for nine years served efficiently their purpose and proved their worth, by no means small, in the world of scholarship. Since, however, the author has added to these volumes two more of the same size, over 400 pages each, and has extended the period treated from 1830 to 1880, the reviewer can hardly ignore the original volumes and give his attention only to the new ones, but is obliged, in the circumstances, to consider the whole work, old and new, as an organic unity.

To cover with efficiency one hundred of the most prolific and revolutionary years in English literature is an impressive under-

cision between *q(ue)* and *qu(e)*, *q(ui)* and *qu(i)*, *passim*, should have been avoided. Inconsistencies in the use of brackets, parentheses and italics, as well as discrepancies between the notes and text, are not infrequent (III, 144, 2214, 2470; v, 170; III, 2493; III, 295, v, 190, p. 11, note*, p. 20**, p. 81*, etc) and the many references of the type "Voyez, sur ce vers, l'Introduction" (III, 499, 1078, etc.) satisfy the conscience of the editor rather than the curiosity of the reader.

taking, even for a group of scholars, but when the task is accomplished single-handed, the display of so much courage, industry, and breadth of judgment demands our highest respect and admiration, and in this case something more—even our gratitude. Others have given the history of certain types of literature for longer periods than that of Mr. Elton's work; Professor Saintsbury has covered in two volumes in a more cursory manner the period from 1780 to 1860; and a group of scholars in the *Cambridge History of English Literature* have treated with the advantages and serious disadvantages of division of labor the period in question. Without belittling the merits of other and previous works in the same field, I am convinced that Mr. Elton has given us results much to be desired—a certain organic unity with component parts seen in their proper perspective, and minor ones not forgotten; a consistent intelligent following by a master mind of the continuity of development which makes no break with the period prior to 1780, admits no interruption in the period discussed, and comes to no clearly marked boundary in 1880. In fact, Professor Elton's healthy respect in the first few pages of his work for the early years of the eighteenth century at once commands our attention and wins our confidence. These years, he informs us, until 1780 are distinguished by the ascendancy of prose. The "reunion of poetry and prose under the rule of the free imagination is the great mark of our literature from 1780 to 1830."

In the first volume (p. 393), in a discussion of the official reviewers, the author recalls Edward Copleston's ironical advice to the young reviewer—"to work chiefly upon the preface of the book that he is noticing, for there he will discover 'a fund of wealth lying upon the surface'; and, above all, to find fault." With little inclination to find fault, though not unmindful that Mr. Elton prefers (III, 116), hard hitting after the manner of Macaulay to "the vague praise, or the cautious innuendo, which now often does duty for criticism," we do, on the other hand, feel impelled to heed well the limitations of this work as outlined in the Preface, to regret that the historical and biographical aspect has been kept well in the background, and that foreign influences have been but lightly touched; but to regard with pleasure the motto from Hazlitt on the title-page of the first edition, unfortunately forgotten in the new,—“I have endeavoured to feel what is good, and to give a reason for the faith that was in me, when

necessary, and when in my power." Like Matthew Arnold, with whom he is on the best of terms in this work, Mr. Elton as a critic is after the best that has been thought and said. So intent is he on bringing this to light, so broad is his conception of what English literature includes, or rather, shall we say, so imbued is he with what we might term a German mania for exhaustiveness, that few prominent minds within the period, regardless of the field of their mental activity, fail to find a place in his pages. Economists, political thinkers, orators, divines, scientists, reviewers, explorers, philosophers, critics, scholars, historians, nondescripts, and a whole galaxy of minor writers form the vast background of the great picture well in front of which, in due order and with proper emphasis, are clearly portrayed the prominent figures in English literature for the hundred years in question. - If the author has not gratified our taste for foreign influences, he has at least made us realize the complicity of the domestic influences that are constantly acting and reacting on the subject-matter of any literature—influences that are too frequently lost to view in our intense search for the ancient, the foreign, and the remote. To expect that Mr. Elton or any one else can speak with authority or finality on each of the multitude that throngs his pages is too much to hope, but we are amazed at the dexterity with which he puts each in his place and rounds up his contribution to the realm of thought.

In the four volumes the author has loaded every line with ore, for the most part of his own mining. We are constantly impressed with the evidence of fresh original investigation, the fruits of sound scholarship and mature judgment. With absolute propriety we may say of Mr. Elton as he has said (III, 295) of Sir Leslie Stephen, "he delivers endless judgments in a brief Tacitean manner without a touch of arrogance." Not infrequently he pauses to weigh and set aside a long-accepted verdict in criticism, occasionally but not often accepting some popular view that should long ago have been forgotten. When, for instance, he states that Burke "detests first principles, derides pure analysis, and uses 'metaphysician' as a term of contumely" (I, 228), and joins with Buckle in taking for granted in Burke's later years "the unsettling of his saner judgment" (I, 239), we cannot agree without some qualifications. He is also too much concerned over "the Wordsworth who was to harden into a far stonier conservatism than

Scott's, and who lost, as Lord Morley has said, his interest in progress about the date of Waterloo (II, 73). Such assertions malign Wordsworth's better fame quite as much as the following statement, made without the light of Professor Harper's recent investigations, shields the regrettable event of his life: "And for self-reproach, as we have said, he has no remedy at all in his wallet; he never had serious occasion for it (II, 96). We, too, should like to dismiss "with satisfaction" the "spectral old scandal of Byron to the limbo of things unproven" (II, 161), and perhaps may yet be able to do so. Shelley must not be too harshly taken to task for a deficiency of remorse and self-reproach when we recall his repudiation of remorse and his determination to have none of it, although we can never know how well he succeeded:

Reproach not thine own soul, but know thyself,
Nor hate another's crime, nor loathe thine own.
It is the dark idolatry of self,
Which, when our thoughts and actions once are gone,
Demands that man should weep and bleed and groan;
Oh vacant expiation! Be at rest.—
The past is Death's the future is thine own.¹

Keats's "Bright star," as Sir Sidney has recently proved,² was not "the last of his poems, written on his voyage, under the shadow of death and the memory of unfulfilled love (II, 238). Neither do we believe that Keats in the expression of his preference of romance to the death-day of empires in the beginning of the second book of *Endymion* "puts the case in a young petulant way which delights us, and is merely true to youth, and romance" (II, 240); for we recall Browning's *Love among the Ruins*, which our author praises highly but misinterprets (III, 376), with its concluding line, "Love is best." We remember, also, in this connection those earnest words of Mr. Colvin penned during the dark days of the late war: "And when the future looks back on to-day, even on to-day, a death-day of empires in a sterner and vaster sense than any the world has known, will all the waste and hatred and horror, all the hope and heroism of the time, its tremendous issues and catastrophes, be really found to have eclipsed and superseded love as the fittest to fill the soul and inspire the songs of the

¹ *The Revolt of Islam*, 8, 22.

² Sir Sidney Colvin, *John Keats*, 1917, pp. 492-3.

poet?"³ In his criticism of Browning's poetry our author at least once is tempted into a certain grotesqueness of statement, a fault of Browning which he does not allow us to forget, and quite overlooks the true significance of the poem in question. "*The Flight of the Duchess*," he writes, "is an expression of the longing for escape which is heard in *Youth and Art*, or in the tale of Jules and Phene. Go off to the gypsies, like the Duchess, or to a garret and live on love, or to 'some unsuspected isle in the far seas!' Go with your mate, your lover, and damn the consequences, for 'God's in his Heaven!'" (III, 371). Browning, if we mistake not, was more intent on ridiculing that from which the escape was made than in defending the escape. He had in mind a fad then too common in England of attempting to restore the lifeless customs of a dead past because they were thought aristocratic. Our author also seems to forget that this poem is put in the mouth of an eccentric character.

But to attempt to record all of the points on which we disagree with Mr. Elton is futile. They are few and widely scattered compared with those on which we are in accord, and perhaps are still fewer compared with those on which we have no decided opinion, and about which we are content to learn from his words of wisdom. For the most part we feel that he brings his message fresh from his reading; only now and then betraying a too implicit reliance on memory, as for instance, in his account of Landor's *The Empress Catherine and Princess Dashkof* he mistakes Dashkof for Catherine's lover (II, 36); or makes Browning's Ivàn Ivànovitch kill his own wife instead of Dmitri's (III, 389); or has Eppie in *Silas Marner* chance "on the discovery of the long-murdered body" (IV, 268); or supposes the son in Byron's *Werner* really falls in love with the daughter of the victim (II, 167); or when he quotes Pope's line on Defoe as "Earless, on high, stands unabashed" (II, 138), instead of "Earless on high, stood unabash'd," as Pope wrote it.

Professor Elton is a critic with strong convictions, but not with prejudices. He approaches his subject with no passionate attachments to defend or inveterate antipathies to revenge. His remarks are everywhere characterized by the spirit of fairness, the desire

³ *Idem.*, p. 183.

to present the truth with no personal bias; by a conservatism that seldom betrays him into such a sweeping and doubtful assertion as: "He [Byron] has affected the spirit of poetry more than any modern man except Shakespeare and Goethe, and on the whole he has deserved to do so" (II, 181); by an inclination to find as much merit and praise as possible; and by no eagerness to linger over faults and scandals. His estimates strike home with a brevity and felicity of expression that startle and please.

The work is very readable, inspiring while it instructs, in a style that is terse, lucid, occasionally tinged with humor or irony, but never carried beyond the bounds of scholarly accuracy on a tide of unrestrained enthusiasm. We have found nothing in the work better than the chapter on Blake; we believe the author more at home with Tennyson than Browning, with Thackeray than Dickens; and admire without applauding his defence of Byron, Macaulay, and Arnold; while we suspect he does not entirely catch the purport and spirit of Carlyle and Newman. On the whole we prefer the first two volumes to the last two, but should not care to lose any. We regret that the valuable notes at the end of each volume did not find a place at the bottom of their respective pages where they would be more serviceable, and that the author did not give us a separate bibliography instead of burying it in his notes. It is to be hoped that in the next issue of the work the separate indices in volumes II and IV will be combined. On the whole this is an excellent, much needed work that will not soon be superseded.

L. N. BROUGHTON.

Cornell University.

The American Novel. By CARL VAN DOREN. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921.

Mr. Van Doren's work is not a series of biographical and critical studies of more or less eminent American novelists. It is, as it professes to be, "a chapter in the history of the American imagination." The term *novel* is consequently interpreted as including "long prose narratives in which the element of fact is on the whole less than the element of fiction," and the method is historical rather than critical. The result is the most valuable contribution

made in recent years to our apparatus for the study of American fiction.

Five of the ten chapters into which the book is divided deal with periods and tendencies: the romance that preceded Cooper, with its three subjects—the Revolution, the Settlement, and the Frontier; Cooper's successors in the romance of adventure; the blood and tears of the dime novelists and the domestic sentimentalists; an account of the rich variety of the productive decade 1880-1890; and a discussion of two reactions from realism—rococo romance toward the right and naturalism toward the left. Interspersed among these are chapters which bear the names of individual authors, who thus emerge as the great names in the history of the American novel. They are Cooper, Hawthorne, Mark Twain, Howells, and Henry James. The preëminence of these five will be conceded by most readers; and Mr. Van Doren's comments on them will be found to be informing and acute. He reminds us that Cooper, whom fate chose to be "the principal romancer of the new nation," showed a tendency toward realism that is sometimes overlooked. "Cooper," he says, . . . "is not to be neglected as an historian. No man better sums up in fiction the older type of republican—rather than democrat—which established the United States. No one—unless possibly Irving—fixed the current heroic conditions of his day more firmly to actual places." Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter*, with which the American novel reached its maturity of art and which remains our supreme example of literary skill, Mr. Van Doren discusses convincingly. His comment on Howells and the realism of which he is our most notable exponent is illuminating. The distinction of writing the first American novel which may be called realistic in a modern sense belongs, he says, to Colonel John W. De Forest of Connecticut for his *Miss Ravenel's Conversion from Secession to Loyalty*.

Howells Mr. Van Doren regards as the most democratic of novelists. "Fenimore Cooper and Hawthorne, both Democrats, could still never leave off complaining that democracy lacks the elements of saliency and color upon which they thought the prosperity of the novelist depends. What his predecessors shrank from, Howells ardently embraced, thoroughly satisfied to portray the plain universe which lay before him . . ." The "sudden, almost explosive, fame of Mark Twain," for which *The Innocents Abroad*

supplied the match, culminates, in the opinion of Mr. Van Doren, in *Huckleberry Finn*, a "glorious" book, which he contrasts with *The Scarlet Letter* as its only possible rival for first place in our fiction. It is a glorious book, in spite of its looseness of structure; and its value as a social satire—its portrayal of slavery from a contemporary point of view, for example—is not always recognized. It is not so much hatred of kings that is the first article of Mark Twain's creed as hatred of every kind of oppression and a blazing espousal of the cause of the under dog. Witness his exhibition of the cruel futility of the Kentucky feud. But his picture of slavery in the little river town is tempered by an understanding of the institution as it actually existed.

Mr. Van Doren's style is agreeable, free from the smartness of paradox, and lighted by whimsically fresh and compact phrasing. He is probably not aware of an overuse of that latest fashion in tropes, *gesture*; we have Pathfinder's "grandiose gesture of surrender," a "gesture of sentimental asceticism" in Fanshawe, and Henry James's conception of "a romantic American gesture quaintly like that of Daniel Boone," which on the same page becomes "this ingratiating gesture." In both style and matter, however, the book is eminently satisfying. It whets the appetite for that promised further volume in which the same author proposes to discuss fully the American novel of the twentieth century.

JOHN C. FRENCH.

The Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE

*La Galerie du Palais*¹

(1) I did not overlook "the lack of liaison between scenes 9 and 10 of Act I." As Dorimant and Lysandre go off to "dîner ensemble," Hippolyte and Florice come on, returning from the Galerie. There is no lack of liaison. (2) My omission of M. Roy's name was quite unintentional. (3) I cannot agree with Professor Lancaster that the author of the *coup d'essai* (102) must be the same as the imitator of Marino (100). The text, far from indicating this, indicates exactly the reverse. In line 98 the Libraire offers Dorimant *two* books, not one. Obviously one of them is by the imitator of Marino; and Dorimant having rejected it scornfully, the Libraire, *referring to the other*, says:

Ce fut son coup d'essai que cette comédie.

¹ Cf. *MLN.* xxxvi, 427-430.

I do not profess to have proved that the date is 1633. I do suggest, however, that the internal evidence supports this date, or, in any case, does not invalidate it; and, as to the external evidence, there seems to be none whatever to suggest 1632 rather than 1633. That line 105 refers to Corneille himself seems substantiated by the poem quoted on p. xlvi. Moreover, the year 1633 fits in well with the suggestion that the imitator of Marino is Saint Amant, although Théophile would fit in almost as well, possibly, and Malleville even better than either. The assumption of 1633 as the date of the *Galerie*, the assumption that the "coup d'essai" is *Mélite* and that either Saint-Amant, Tristan, or Malleville is the imitator of Marino, fit in together. The triple assumption makes an hypothesis, which is not contradicted by any *facts* that have come to light.

T. B. RUDMOSE-BROWN.

Trinity College, Dublin.

A REPLY

1. Professor R.-B. evidently confuses *liaison des scènes* with unity of place; there is certainly no *liaison* between these scenes. 3. I repeat that there is no reason for assuming that in this passage Corneille had any special play or author in mind. He was writing what his audience could understand; he was not interested in creating puzzles for future philologists. But if he did have some one in mind, it is far more likely to have been Scudéry than himself, for the person to whom he refers is accused of imitating Marino. Professor R.-B. seeks to avoid this difficulty by explaining that two *authors* are referred to, but the *son* of line 102 must refer to the person discussed in the preceding line. This is not only my interpretation, but that of several Frenchmen to whom I have submitted the question. Professor R.-B.'s whole argument falls to the ground with his misinterpretation of this construction and there remains no reason for believing that the play was written in 1633 rather than 1632.

H. C. LANCASTER.

MILTON'S *Comus*, 93-94

In *Mod. Lang. Notes* xxxv, 441, and xxxvi, 414, Professor John A. Himes puts aside all the usual interpretations of "the star that bids the shepherd fold" in Milton's *Comus* 93-4, on the ground that the "evening star (or planet) does not at folding time appear at 'the top of heaven'." He proposes for the single star the constellation Leo (with its bright star Regulus), because "in May, the critical month for flocks, the constellation Leo is in the zenith shortly after sunset." He adds, "as the lion, ac-

ording to Homer (*Il.* x, 485, and often), is the menace to flocks, the appearance of the constellation is a warning to shepherds." Mr. Himes makes no reference to a use by any writer, ancient or modern, of the constellation Leo as "the star that bids the shepherd fold," or explains in any way such definite references to Vesper and the shepherd's folding his flocks as in the pseudo-Virgilian *Culex* 202-5, Spenser's *Virgil's Gnat* 313 ff., or other passages of similar import in classical or English poetry. He had not perhaps seen my article in *Anglia* xxxix, 495 ff.

To that article, and as further tending to show that Milton's "top of heaven" was not so impossible for poetry of the time, I may now add one other reference in Spenser, Milton's master. In *F. Q.* i, ii, st. 6 he placed "Hesperus in highest skie," as he had placed the same star "in top of heaven sheene" in *F. Q.* iii, iv, st. 51. For similar inaccuracies of Milton and others, see the article above mentioned.

"The star that bids the shepherd fold" is naturally the shepherd star. What would seem to be conclusive proof of the meaning of that term, at least in Elizabethan times, may be added from another source. In 1591 Thomas Bradshaw published a book with the title

The Shepherds Starre/ NOW OF LATE SEENE and/ at this hower to be observed merveilous orient/ in the East: which bringeth glad tidings to all/ that may behold her brightness, having/ the foure elements with the foure Capitall/ Virtues in her, which makes her/ Elementall and a vanquisher of all/ Earthly humors.

The book was dedicated to the Earl of Essex and Thomas Lord Burgh, baron of Gainsborough, and was entered in the *Stationers' Register* Apr. 29, 1591. The author was in the Netherlands with the English regiments which helped Henry IV of France, but a letter of his brother Alex. Bradshaw is prefixed to the book and dated Apr. 23. The book doubtless appeared shortly after the later of these dates.

With the book itself, a lengthy paraphrase of the third *Idyl* of Theocritus, we have nothing now to do. But the allusion to the shepherd star "at this hower to be observed merveilous orient in the east" can be no other than one to the morning star of the time, a star then displaying unusual brilliancy. Now the morning star in March and April 1591, as I am informed by our Naval Observatory at Washington, was Mars, which was then approaching opposition and becoming very brilliant. Venus and Saturn were evening stars at the time, and Jupiter was in the zenith at midnight. Nor is there any evidence of any comet, new star, or other similar phenomenon which could have been in the mind of

the author of the *Shepherds Starre*. Without question the shepherd star of Bradshaw was the morning star of the time, the unfolding star of poetry. It is a natural inference that the shepherd star connected with the folding of the sheep was Venus, or the evening star of the period, no matter how careless the poet may have been in placing it in the sky, during ages none too careful about references to the external world.¹

OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON.

Western Reserve University.

"Under the sonne he loketh"

Commentators, so far as I know, have been unable to find any occurrence of this idiom except in the well-known passage in *The Knight's Tale*, line 839:

And whan this duk was come unto the launde,
Under the sonne he loketh, and anon
He was war of Arcite and Palamon.

Every reader doubtless conjectures that the words mean nothing more than that Duke Theseus looked all round, turning from one point of the compass to the other, and that the expression must have been a current and popular one when Chaucer wrote. But, if so, why have not other occurrences of the idiom been found? Did it die out after Chaucer's time?

It would seem to have died out in the more standardized forms of written speech but to have been preserved in the popular ballads, which of course reproduce oral speech. In *Bewick and Graham*, which is ballad number 211 in Child's collection, one stanza of the eighteenth-century version runs:

He lookd between him and the sun,
To see what farleys he coud see;
There he spy'd a man with armour on,
As he came riding over the lee.

This is only an approximation of the expression, however. Better examples occur in two versions of *Fair Annie*, number 62 in Child's collection, one of which has recently been found in North Carolina, the other in Virginia. The North Carolina version, taken down

¹ Proof of the *Anglia* article above never reached me, and some misprints occur, most of them easily corrected. Two or three references are misleading, since page references to my MS. were used instead of the corresponding pages of the article when printed. Thus, on page 507 the reference at end of line eight should be p. 500; in footnote 3 the reference should be to p. 497; on the footnote to p. 508, it should read p. 500.

by the English balladist, Cecil J. Sharp, from the singing of Mrs. Jane Gentry, of Madison county, has as its second stanza,

She took her spy glass in her hands
And out of doors she went;
She looked to the East, West, both North and South,
And looked all under the sun.

The Virginia version was sent to me only a few days ago by Mr. John Stone, of Albemarle county. He took it down from the singing of Mrs. Martha Elizabeth Lethcoe, of Washington county. Stanza five in her version is,

She looked east, she looked west,
She looked all under the sun;
And she saw Lord Thomas
Bringing his bridal home.

These examples prove, I think, that Chaucer, as conjectured, meant nothing more than that Duke Theseus looked all round, literally boxed the compass, before he saw Palamon and Arcite; but the provisional conjecture has become a practical certainty. They prove also that, though the expression may have left the shores of Great Britain, though it may be disdained by the pen of the scholar, it lives on the tongue of the plain people in our own Appalachian mountains. Do they not hint also, if they do not prove, that a rich field of unharvested syntax is still awaiting the investigator of these English and Scottish ballads, especially in their American survivals?

C. ALPHONSO SMITH.

U. S. Naval Academy.

A LOST PLAY BY ALEXANDRE HARDY: *La Follie de Clidamant*

In Professor H. Carrington Lancaster's edition of the *Mémoire de Mahelot, Laurent et d'autres décorateurs de l' Hôtel de Bourgogne* (Paris, Champion, 1920, p. 73) is reproduced the stage-setting of a lost play by Alex. Hardy: *La Follie de Clidamant*. The text reads as follows: "*La Follie de Clidamant, de Mr Hardy: Il faut, au milieu du theatre, un beau palais; et, a un des costez une mer, ou paroist un vaisseau garny de mats et de voiles, ou paroist une femme qui se jette dans la mer; et, a l'autre costé, une belle chambre qui s'ouvre et ferme, ou il y ait un liet bien paré avec des draps; du san.*"

These properties fit, in the main, a story narrated in a *Roman à clef* which was very popular in the first decades of the seventeenth century, *La Polyxène* by François Hugues de Molière d' Essertines, first printed in 1623.¹ It bears the title: *Histoire de Clorýman*,

¹ About the murder of Molière d' Essertines, the two continuations of his *Polyxène*, etc., see Lachèvre, *Bibliographie des Recueils Collectifs*. About his relations to Camus, Bishop of Belley, see Bayer, *J. P. Camus und seine*

d' *Isménie et de Polyxène*, and is found chiefly at the end of Book II and the beginning of Book III. In Book I already Molière d' Essertines depicted the love of Isménie for Cloryman, who loves Polyxène. Isménie's jealousy makes communication difficult between Polyxène and Cloryman. A stratagem is invented: Ardanil, a servant of Cloryman pretends to be mad (p. 102 sq.) and, while raving, he communicates his master's messages to Polyxène. Isménie is forced by her father, the King of Syria, to marry Alceste, son of the King of Cilicie (p. 347). She embarks on a ship with prince Alceste, but jumps into the sea and is believed dead. Cloryman, meanwhile, arrives in Armenia at the house of a knight, Alcidor, where he finds Isménie. It soon is explained (p. 414 sq.) that she had been rescued by pirates and, after two days of imprisonment on board their vessel, had been delivered by Alcidor, the Armenian knight. Cloryman escapes with her, and, accompanied by his "Domestique" Mélandre, reaches an island. But Mélandre is false to his master. He falls in love with Isménie, and one night he tries to kill Cloryman in his bed. After this deed, he abducts Isménie and embarks on a ship (p. 447 sq.). On board, however, they meet Damastée, a knight in disguise, who consoles and protects the forlorn Isménie until they meet a ship from Cilicie which captures them. Damastée makes public the crime committed by Mélandre, who is arrested and condemned to death. Isménie, blaming all her misfortune on her beauty, disfigures herself² but even then she is still attractive enough to be brought to Prince Alceste, who is still mourning her. After a reconciliation, she marries him. Cloryman, having recovered from his wounds, comes back at the time of her marriage, and meets her secretly in a temple. Soon after that she dies.³

If Hardy had staged this story, the palace could have been used for the first part of the play: the rivalry between Isménie and Polyxène for Cloryman, with the madness scenes of the servant Ardanil. The ship from which a woman jumps into the sea fits the attempted suicide of Isménie. The palace again could have served for the scenes in the Chateau of the Armenian knight. The bed and the blood could have been used to stage the attempted murder of Cloryman by the unfaithful Mélandre, while the last scenes, the meeting of Isménie with the Prince Alceste in his palace, could have been played again in the "Beau palais" of Mahe-lot's stage setting.

This possible identification of the source of Hardy's play hardly accounts for the title: *La Follie de Clidamant*. Could it refer to

Romane. For the contemporary noblemen whose adventures he is supposed to narrate, see Drujon, *Les Romans à Clef*.

² This is a reminiscence of the *Astrée*, in which Celidée disfigures herself, *Histoire de Celidée, Thamire et Calidon*.

³ The meeting in the temple is another reminiscence of the *Astrée*. Celadon also hides in a Temple.—Cf. vol. I.

the ravings of Cloriman's servant, who is pretending to be mad at the beginning of the story? Or can it be supposed that Hardy would have introduced the customary scene of the ravings of a character who believes he is dead and in the company of ghosts and gods? He would have had an occasion for the introduction of such a scene during the recovery of the wounded Cloriman. That he had a preference for such outbursts of real or supposed madness can be seen by the titles of two other of his lost plays: *La Folie de Turlupin* (*Mém. de Mahelot*. Ed. H. C. Lancaster, p. 70) and *La Folie d'Ysabelle* (*id.*, p. 74). In either case, however, Hardy would have given to his play a title drawn from a secondary episode in his story, which is not his custom.

It is possible, on the other hand, that Hardy's play is based on another story containing incidents similar to those of de Molière's *Polyxène*. In such case the suggestion made here may be a step toward its discovery.

GUST. L. VAN ROOSBROECK.

University of Minnesota.

[Mr. van R. accounts for the scenery and properties mentioned. As the notices referring to Hardy's plays are often incomplete, the omission by Mahelot of a second palace is not a serious difficulty. He does not, however, explain the title, for the name Clidamant does not appear in the novel, nor is the hero of it mad. If there were a larger number of properties mentioned and identified, this objection would be less serious. As it is, I can only say that, although this is the best identification that has been proposed, the evidence is not altogether conclusive.—H. C. L.]

ETYMOLOGY OF *Burlingame* (*Burlingham*)

Burlingham is the older, and historically the more correct form. The type of formation is identical with that of *Buckingham*. The third and last element is OE. *hām* 'home.' The first element is not, as might at first sight appear, OE. *būr* ([*ge*]būr) 'farmer,' ModE. *boor*. Bardsley cites (p. 149) *Hugh de Byrlingham*, *Hundred Rolls*, 1273 A. D. OE. *ū* never yields MidE. *y*. It is OE. *byr*[*e*]le 'cupbearer, tapster.' The second element is the patronymic and diminutive suffix *-ling* 'son of.' The word *byrling* (*burling*) therefore means 'cupbearer's or tapster's son, little tapster, bar-boy.' Although cited in no Dictionary, it must nevertheless have existed, for the modern form *Burling* is fairly common. It is barely possible that the name *Burling* is identical with *burling* cited by Murray, but this is unlikely. *Byrlingham* (*Burlingham*) therefore means *Home of the Byrlings*, *Home of the Bar-Boys*. The final *-e* was added in the 14th century to indicate that the preceding vowel was long. Compare *Cunningham*(*e*).

The word *byr*[*e*]le is of unusual interest. It means literally 'bear-er,' *byr* being derived from *ber-an* 'bear,' and *-le* functioning

as *suffix agentis*. A *byr-le* was a man who tapped or drew or poured wine or beer and 'bore' and served it to the patrons of his tavern. The *byr-ling* was his son, the bar-boy. The denominative verb *byr[e]lian*, formed with the *-jo* suffix, meant originally 'to act as *byr[e]le*.' Bosworth-Toller defines it 'pour out, give to drink, serve.' Murray cites occurrences of the word in *Beowulf* (before 1000 A. D.), and in Aelfric (about 1000). The word was therefore brought to England from the Continent by the earliest Anglo-Saxon invaders. The following citations by Murray are of interest: *Wyclif* c 1380—'Thei drinke . . . and birlan it to othere men. *Lanc. Gloss.* 1875—'Birl out th' beer.' Murray defines the noun *birle* 'one who pours out a drink; cupbearer, butler;' and the verb *birle* 'to draw or pour out (drink).' The *English Dialect Dictionary* defines the latter: 1. to pour out liquor, to pass round, to ply with drink. 2. to drink hard, to carouse. The verb is still current in the vernacular of the North of England and Scotland.

Burlingham is the form of the name invariably used in England. It is pronounced *Búrling-um*, with a heavy stress on the first syllable. Due to the lack of stress on the last syllable, the *h*-sound disappeared, and, in America, the letter with it. With *Burling-ham* *Burling-hame* *Burling-ame*, compare *Cunning-ham* *Cunning-hame* *Cunning-ame*, and *Farn-ham* *Farn-am* *Farn-um*. Despite the change of spelling, *Burling-ame* is still pronounced *Búrling-um* in Philadelphia, Baltimore, and the South. But in New England and New York, where the name is rather common, due to the influence of the written form, popular etymology has been at work, the result being that the name is divided and pronounced *Burlin-game*, or *Burling-game*,—a species of *game*! *Cunning* (from *cyn[in]g* 'the knowing one, king') saved *Cunning-hame*!

Albany, N. Y.

E. W. BURLINGAME.

References:—C. W. Bardsley, *Dictionary of English and Welsh Surnames*, p. 149; H. Harrison, *Surnames of the United Kingdom*, vol. 1, pp. 58-59; Bosworth and Toller, *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, sub *vocibus byrle, byrlian*; Murray, *New English Dictionary*, sub *voce birle*; *English Dialect Dictionary*, sub *voce birle*. On final *-e*, see Skeat, *Principles of English Etymology*, First Series, p. 310.

BRIEF MENTION

The Hound of Heaven: An Interpretation, by Francis P. LeBuffe, S. J., Professor of Psychology, Fordham University, Graduate School (New York, The Macmillan Co., 1921). The popularity of Francis Thompson's remarkable poem has a background that may be represented by H. D. Traill's exclamation: "A 'public' to appreciate 'The Hound of Heaven' is to me inconceivable" (Everard Maynell, *The Life of Francis Thompson*, 1913, p. 144). Mr. Maynell then adds: "Mr. William Archer, a splendid appre-

ciator, expressed much the same view." But the context indicates a change in the color of the light thrown upon that background: "Yet in the three years after Thompson's death the separate edition of 'The Hound of Heaven' sold fifty thousand copies; and, apart from anthologies, many more thousands were sold of the books containing it." As to another aspect of Thompson's rightful recognition, it will be noticed that the author of the 'Interpretation' which is the subject of this notice disproves by his professional badge the continuance in Catholic circles of that neglect of the poet lamented by Canon Sheehan in 1889 (Maynell, p. 143). And, to keep this observation within narrowest limits, it will be remembered that the Rev. J. F. X. O'Connor, S. J., published 'A Study' of the poem in 1912 (N. Y., John Lane Co.).

Mr. Archer's earlier judgment of the poem was afterwards revised in his more complete study of the poet (*Poets of the Younger Generation*.—The Prefatory Note is dated 1901). "But the first thing to be done," says Mr. Archer, "and by far the most important, is to recognize and declare that we are here face to face with a poet of the first order—a man of imagination all compact, a seer and singer of rare genius. . . . If ever there was a born poet, a poet in spite of himself, who lisped in metaphors for the metaphors came, this surely is he. His worst faults proceed from excess, not from defect, of poetic endowment." Mr. Archer moreover places the poet in the company of the mystical poets, and in his explanation of this association finds its basis in Thompson's catholicism. "How comes it, then," he writes, "that a poet who sees the material universe so intensely and, up to a certain point, so intrepidly, should, when that point is reached, plunge into the theological mysticism which speaks in *The Hound of Heaven* and *To the Dead Cardinal of Westminster*, in *Assumpta Maria* and *Any Saint*, and in a hundred incidental passages throughout his work? The explanation, I think, is not far to seek. Catholicism is Mr. Thompson's refuge from Pantheism, a creed, or rather a philosophy, too cold to satisfy the poet within him."

Caution is always to be administered in the study of a poet's theology. Some poets are, of course, strictly orthodox; others conceal various degrees of heterodoxy under the venerable and glowing symbolism of orthodoxy. The poets of the second class, thru the adopted symbolism, inevitably invite an interpretation favorable to a canon of convictions that in a too restrictive sense hems in the poet's freedom of thought. Joyce Kilmer and Father Tabb clothe the symbols of the Church in fresh, imaginative beauty, but they do this with completely sincere acceptance of indoctrinated belief. Thompson may be read under the same assumption, but that reading is probably not completely correct. In the last strophe of the poet's *Orient Ode*, for example, Mr. Archer does not recognize "the evangelical Christ"; he holds that the symbol visualizes a force less dogmatically conceived.

On the other hand, Father LeBuffe analyzes the poem in all its details into the elements of common personal experience and expounds it in accordance with traditional exegesis. Not assuming that in "this endeavor of the soul to make away from God" we are to read definite incidents in the poet's experiences, he confidently declares: "What is of interest and what secures the widest appeal for the poem is that it is autobiographical of 'a' soul, in aspects common to it and all mankind, and therefore autobiographical of *every* soul." In commenting on the fleeing and the pursuit, the industrious and earnest exegete avails himself of Scripture and a wide survey of literature, and offers the results of years of study and meditation bestowed upon the poem. Scripture, of course, supplies the chief portion of what is drawn into the notes so pertinently as to impress the reader with the commentator's skilful selection and his power of persuasive interpretation. Citations from the poet's other compositions have an authenticity of their own; and the measured, illustrative stress put upon them will win approval for the citations from Tennyson, Wordsworth, Shelley, O'Shaughnessy, Trench, Robert Southwell, W. H. Mallock, Sidney Lanier, Coventry Patmore, Father Ryan, Father Tabb, C. Scollard, and Joyce Kilmer. Saintry authors make their contribution, St. Augustine, St. John Chrysostom, St. Francis Xavier, and Thomas Kempis; and there are references to Homer, Æschylus, Aristotle, Virgil, and Dante. One observes that Father LeBuffe has apparently overlooked Mr. Paul Elmer More's reference to Æschylus' *Erinnyes* (*Shelburne Essays*, 7th ser., 1910, p. 163), which is especially interesting for a suggestion pertaining to the title of the poem,—a title that the poet has not seen fit to introduce into the text at any point.

Father LeBuffe has composed so complete a commentary on the poem (pp. 27-89) as to leave for no grade of readers any possible questions unanswered. Besides, he has taken occasion to intersperse good preachments, and these will at least not harm any reader. A partial view of the various character of the Notes may be indicated. Thus, as to the poet's 'Grammar of Assent,' a few lines may be taken from the Note against line 60, *Their Angel plucked them* etc.: "Did Thompson have in mind here the story of Ganyমে of pagan mythology, and of Habacuc (Daniel xiv, 32-38)? He certainly had in mind the Catholic belief in Guardian Angels." And the Note against *dead sanctities* of line 86 contains this: "Compare the opening verses of 'Orient Ode,' wherein Thompson bases his imagery on the Catholic ritual of Benediction." So in the rather obscure lines 152-154 a question is asked the answer to which would contain "the whole doctrine of mortification, so grossly misunderstood by many,"—a doctrine of which "Thompson had quite a singular grasp. . . . He puts it tersely in 'Any Saint.'" The thought is also illustrated by quoting Tennyson's

That men may rise on stepping-stones
Of their dead selves to higher things.

Less pertinent, if pertinent at all, is the inference drawn from line 82 that the poet had in mind a "parallel between the seasons of the soul and the Church's liturgical seasons."

The commentator is not daunted by the poet's "profuseness of metaphor" in lines 136-140, but proceeds to show that there is "no confusion" here. Explanatory clauses are: "the fitful shower merely moistens the dust and does not sink into and fructify the earth."—"The efforts of youth are wont to be spasmodic and unstable." But less obvious is the metaphor of the *broken font*, which "is taken from a broken, discarded well over which hangs a gaunt, stark tree from whose souging branches the bleak wind spills down into the stagnant waters below the drops of rain which seem to ooze out of the branches." From the desolate and depressed mind are distilled *tear-drippings* and *dank thoughts* from its *sighful branches*, "and these fall into a heart that has lost all motion, suffering that dreadful paralysis that comes from excessive sorrow." In submitting this interpretation it is added: "We need not press the word 'branches' to find a strict parallel in the mind. It merely fills out the picture, indicating that there was no quarter of the mind that offered anything but sadness and depression."

One more Note shall be cited to show the commentator's gentle and reflective observation of common experience, and also his manner of distinguishing a mere suggestion. Of lines 70-72, he observes "The meaning seems to be, that in the early hours, before the turmoil of life taints the earth, Nature's children drink of the dews which come pure and clean and sparkling (*lucent-weeping* = pouring forth light) out of the morning's chalice." And the good story is added, that Corot "used to fold up his kit at sunrise and go into the house, saying that beauty vanished with the broad daylight."

Surely more has been cited than would be sufficient to characterize Father LeBuffe's sincere and pains-taking task of interpreting the poem which has been so highly praised, with however the tacit admission (one must assume) that some lines are too mystical or figurative for exact analysis. The reader will regard the commentary instructive thru its illustrations of the thought drawn from Scripture, from Thompson's other poems, and from the authors enumerated above. Additional references for the symbol of the 'Love-Chase' have been supplied in *The Mystical Poets of the English Church*, by Percy H. Osmond (S. P. C. K., 1919),—a book in which a short section is devoted to Thompson. This has not been noticed by Father LeBuffe; nor has he paid any attention (if, as Professor of Psychology, he has been aware of it), to Thomas Verner Moore's psychoanalytic study of the poem (*The Psychoanalytic Review*, vol. v, 1918). Here the point-of-view is

strictly autobiographical, and the discussion is to demonstrate "the distinction between *libido* and control," whatever the value of the demonstration may be.

J. W. B.

No very definite principle seems to have guided Mr. T. R. Smith in his compilation of the anthology of Swinburne's "Poems" issued in "The Modern Library" (Boni and Liveright). There is still room for a satisfactory anthology of Swinburne. The poet's own selection, issued so long ago as the eighties, was a distinct disappointment; William Sharpe's Tauchnitz collection, besides devoting disproportionate space to a reprint of "Atalanta in Calydon" entire, wasted so much of the remainder upon Swinburne's *juvenilia* as to draw forth a protest from the poet himself; the "Selected Poems" published by Messrs. Harper is a mere reissue of "Poems and Ballads" with the addition of barely enough other material to justify the altered title-page; the selection in the Belles-Lettres Series edited by Mr. W. M. Payne, in some respects admirable, in the laudable effort to emphasize the work of the poet's maturity, disregards the earlier poems to an extent that conceals the importance and the brilliance of Swinburne's first phase. The present collection goes to the opposite extreme, and devotes nearly two-thirds of the contents to a selection from "Poems and Ballads," including not only the great obvious things but many poems of little worth except as they tend to justify the advertisement, put by the publishers upon the paper cover, of Swinburne as representing "the world of the flesh." "Cleopatra," which a frank friend told Swinburne was "a mere farrago of commonplaces of his earlier style" and which the poet himself never reprinted, is here given a place of honor. While various vagaries of a juvenile and not very healthy imagination are reprinted, the splendid lyric of genuine passionate experience "At a Month's End" is not given, and what shall be said of a collection that omits "Ave atque Vale," "The Last Oracle," "The Pilgrims," and "Master Triumphalis"? There are excerpts from "Atalanta" and one chorus from "Erechtheus"; but "Tristram of Lyonesse" is entirely ignored. The publishers' claim that "each poem is printed complete" is contradicted by the fact that of "By the North Sea" only one section, and that not the best, is given. To quarrel with the makers of anthologies is generally to trespass upon ground concerning which there is no disputing; in this case, however, it is not merely the question of taste that is at issue. We are glad to hear that Mr. William Heinemann intends to publish shortly what will, we trust, be a more representative volume of selections from Swinburne's poems.

S. C. C.